THE OBSERVATOR OBSERVED:

OR,

ANIMADVERSIONS

UPON THE

OBSERVATIONS on the HISTORY

OF

KING CHARLES.

WHEREIN

That HISTORY is Vindicated, partly Illuſtrated,
And ſeverall other things tending to the Rectification
of ſome publique miſtakes, are inſerted.

To which is added, at the latter end, the
OBSERVATORS Rejoinder.

Οὐ πάνυ γε ῥᾴδιόν ἐστιν εὑρεῖν ἔργον, ἐφ' ᾧ ἂν ἄν τις αἰτίαν ἔχοι.
Ξενοφῶν Ἀπομνημον. Βιβλ. γ.

JAMES Chap. 3. v. 8.
But the Tongue can no man tame.

LONDON,
Printed by *T. C.* for *Edw. Dod*, and are to be ſold at the
Gunne in *Ivy-lane*. 1656.

LONG CHANGES

OF

VARIATIONS

OF

OBSERVED:

THE

To the Reader.

Gentle Reader,

DID I not tell thee so? That some [*Oblique descants would come traverse upon my honest Narrative.*] Those Oblique descents *are the Observations mentioned in the Title leaf, being* descants oblique *enough, not onely upon my Narative, but upon or rather against* King Charles; *so that the Title of his Pamphlet might rather have been formed into the Observations against* King Charles, *then Observations upon his History. These Observations are Usher'd in with an addresse* to the worthily esteemed, *my self. In this Addresse I read my Charge, and it is this,* [*Either my Intelligence or my diligence hath failed me, or my judgement is not well informed, or I have been byassed from the Mark of* Truth *by the excess and transport of mine own affections.*] *Having thus bespattered me, he seems desirous to wash me clean again with a little of his holy water, saying* [*he hath my parts & person in an high esteem*] *but in very truth the mysterie of the businesse is, to make the world believe I am worthy the overcomming. If in this I mistake, and the man be real, yet I heartily wish he would hereafter spare that cost of complyment, which is but cast away on me, who value his bits as little as his* knocks: *And this is all I shall say to his Epistle. Next he should come to open the evidence of his Accusation; but he is staid, see how.*

Page. 1.

Obſervator. *I thought it fit to prepare the way by offering ſome conſiderations at the Authors* Stile, *which by reaſon of many lofty words, no* Engliſh *reader can* climb *over.*

Anſwer. Stile, unknown, lofty, and *climb over* ! Here's a woodden conceit made by as woodden an Obſervator, who, had not his head (all but the face) been made of blocks, or had he conſulted ancient Authors, he might have known that the word *ſtile* uſed by writers, was not made of wood, as this obſervator ſuppoſeth, but of mettal; the very ſame with his own face, one end whereof was ſerviceable as a pen, the other as a knife to race or ſcrape out what was amiſſe. As to thoſe lofty words, I declare to all the world, this, not uningenuous acknowledgment, that having converſed with Authors of the Nobleſt and cheif Remarque in ſeveral languages, not onely their nations, but their very words, eſpecially being of the moſt elegant import, became at length ſo familiar with me, as when I apply'd my ſelf to that preſent work, I found it very difficult to renounce my former acquaintance with them; but as they freely offred themſelves, ſo I entertain'd them upon theſe conſiderations. Firſt, I was confident that amongſt learned men they needed no other paſſe then their own extraction. And for thoſe who were meer Engliſh readers I ſaw no reaſon they ſhould wonder at them, conſidering that for their ſatisfaction, I had ſent along with every forreigner his interpreter to ſerve inſtead of a Dictionary.

Then I had obſerved that our language had of late already admitted very neer all of them into ſo frequent uſe in ordinary diſcourſe, as almoſt amounted to a Naturalization of them amongſt us.

Laſtly, I was perſwaded, ſo long as my Narrative was evenly carri'd, and tolera bly true, a canded Reader would have pardoned that blemiſh of my Stile, eſpecially ſuch an one as takes notice that two Hiſtorians *Livy* and *Saluſt* lie under the ſame cenſure; the firſt for his *Pataviniy*, as *Aſinius* called it, the other for his obſolete words extracted from *Cato de Originibus*, as *Auguſtus* ſaid; yet notwithſtanding are by ſome thought to carry away the Garland from all their fellows.

The premiſes conſidered, I ſhall demand of the obſervator in the words of his own *Horace, de arte Poetica.*

Ego cur acquirere, panca
Si poſſum invideor, cum lingua Catonis & Enni
Sermonem patrium ditaverit, & nova rerum
Nomina protulerit. i. e.

If

If I a word or two new forge, what then?
So did old *Cato* and elder *Ennius*, Men
Who on old things impoſing names new-coyn'd,
Rendred the Roman language more refin'd.

Page. 7.

Fol. 2. *To whom the Prince returned anſwer that he would impower the Earl of* Briſtow *to give his Majeſty all ſatisfaction in that particular*] *That is to ſay (for ſo it muſt be underſtood in the words foregoing) that he would make a Proxy to the Earl of* Briſtow *to celebrate (in his name) the marriage with the Lady* Infanta. *But there was no ſuch Proxy made to the Earl of* Briſtow, *that being a power and truſt thought worthy of the* Catholique *King and* Don. *Charles his Brother, as appeareth plainly, &c.*

Anſwer. What a do is here about nothing? Had the Obſervator well conſidered and adviſed with the next page (the third) he might have found there, that I no leſſe then twice ſpoke of the Earls delivering up the Proxy, clearly importing it was onely in his cuſtody to conſign to another, and that was indeed to the King of *Spain* only, not to *him* and *Don Charles*, as the Obſervator ſaith, of whom I would gladly learn, who that *Don Charles* was, he being the firſt *Don Charles*, I, or I think, any elſe ever heard of. So that here the Obſervator was out himſelf, I take it.

Page. 9.

Fol. 5. *England ever found the Spaniard a worſe friend then enemy*] *for this I think you have no reaſon; the amity and correſpondence between thoſe Nations having continued firm for many ages and never broke (if not now of late) but by the Engliſh or on theſe occaſions. Firſt by the invaſion of* Spain *by the Black Prince, &c.*

Anſwer. What I ſpake here of England, any faire-manner'd Interpreter will judge to be meant of England in the quality ſhe then and now is, that is, in the ſtate of Reformation, of which I hope there is no doubt, and the Obſervator ſeems to confeſſe it.

Page. 10.

Ibid. *Who perceiving upon the whole ſum that the ſly Spaniard practiſed to make an aftergame of the Palatinate*] *King* James *was not to be told that, now reſerved as an aftergame, but yet intended to be plai'd by the Spaniſh Court to the more honour and advantage of the Engliſh; for thus I find it in a letter from the Earl of* Briſtow, *Oct. 28. For the buſineſſe of the Palatinate &c. Theſe words give me no ſmall aſſurance of the integrity and good meaning of the Court of Spain.*

Anſwer.

Anſwer. Whither or not King *James* was to be told this, now I do not determine; ſure I am, told he was of it. And whereas the Obſervator is become a ſtout advocate for the Spaniſh faith, in the point both of the match and the *Pallatinate*, had he peruſed the letter of King *Philip* the third to the *Conde* of *Olivares* extant in the laſt *Cabala*, and recited in Parliament, he might there have found that neither was ſincerely intended, but meerly delayes ſought for by the Spaniard to accompliſh his perfidious ends. And as for *Briſtowes* letter inſiſted upon by the Obſervator, it ſignifyeth nothing to the vindication of the Spaniſh faith; that Earl being articled againſt in Parliament for abuſing both the King and Prince with a falſe perſwaſion of *Spains* ſincerity.

Page. 12.

Fol. 4. *Which being new, and the buſineſſe propounded, it was entertain'd with an unanimous conſent and a motion made that an Ambaſſador ſhould be ſent over to negotiate that Treaty*] *I ſomewhat doubt of your intelligence, the marriage of the Prince containing ſuch a branch of the Royal Prerogative as King* James *was not likely to communicate with his Houſes of Parliament. For when he was Petitioned by both Houſes not long before, that for the avoyding of ſome dangers which did ſeem to threaten the whole Kingdom, he would marry the Prince to a Lady of the Proteſtant Religion, he entertain'd the motion with no ſmall diſdain.*

Anſwer. The Logick of the Obſervator! The King was angry when the Parliament moved him concerning the mariage of the Prince. *Ergo* (which is in Engliſh therefore) he would not communicate with them in one of his own liking. Again, it was no more leſſening of his Prerogative to communicate with them in the entrance into, then in the breach of a Treaty of that nature, as he did in that of *Spain*, which was the main buſineſſe debated in the Parliament, 21. *Jac.*

Page. 13.

Ibid. *In the ſtile of the Court he went for Great Britaines* Solomon] *That he was Great* Solomon, *that is to ſay, either the wiſeſt man or wiſeſt King of the Britiſh Nation, I am not Courtier enough to defend or ſay. It is true indeed that he much pleaſed himſelf with boaſting of his King-Craft; but I have heard many wiſe men ſay that they could never find what that King-Craft was.*

Anſwer. The Obſervator here falls foul upon King *James*, inveighing againſt and withal detracting from his *King-Craft*: Pitty it is his Obſervations came ſo tarde into the world, that Squire *Sanderſon* took no notice of them in this particular, who would elſe have taught him either more wit or manners.

Page. 14.

Page. 14.

Fol. 5. *A ſtout adverſary he was to the* Arminians, *and* Semipelagians *whom he call'd, as* Proſper *before him, the enemies of Gods grace*] *In this ſhort Sentence, there are many things to be conſidered.* 1. *What theſe* Arminians *were which our Author ſpeaks of.* 2. *Whether they were the enemies of Gods grace, or not.* 3. *What the Reaſon was, why King* James *ſhew'd himſelf ſo great an adverſary to them.*

Anſwer. In the perſuance of theſe *three particulars*, the Obſervator ſpends not leſſe then 10. pages, wherein though I am very little concerned, yet I ſhall take the liberty to obſerve theſe few things. Firſt, he ſaith St. *Auguſtines* zeal againſt the *Pelagian* hereſy, tranſported him into inconvenient expreſſions. It were a very proper work, for this Obſervator, to inſtance to us thoſe inconvenient expreſſions, and to undertake the confutation of him, as he is preſented to the world by *Janſenius*. Secondly, he imputeth to them of *Calvins* way, this opinion that a man is forcibly drawn and irreſiſtibly with the cords of grace, in the work of converſion. Let him produce the men *who*, and *where* they ſay it. They take away indeed an actual reſiſtance of the will, as inconſiſtent, *ſimul & ſemel*, with efficacious grace, but none I think, aſſert this irreſiſtibility the Obſervator mentioneth; Nor is this all, but *they hold* alſo, ſaith he, *that man contributeth nothing to his own eternity*. A thing I am confident never declared *in terminis* by any; but ſeeing the man ſeems to account it as one of their errours, I would gladly learn, and have the Obſervator explain this Metaphyſical whimwham, how Eternity (for ſo he ſaith, not *Salvation*) can *recipere majus & minus*, receive either augmentation, or diminution from man. Laſtly, he endeavoureth to ſhew that King *James* was much governed by Doctor *Mountague*, Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, who being of a contrary perſwaſion, put him upon many harſh and ſevere expreſſions againſt thoſe poor men. But this *Mountague* being dead, he began to ſhew himſelf more favourable unto thoſe opinions, eſpecially upon the comming out of a book, of another *Mountague* then Prebend of *Windſor*; whoſe judgment in thoſe points he liked very wel. A thing moſt unlikely; for in Theological controverſies, it is well known King *James* was able enough to go alone, & needed not like a child, be led up and down by the hanging ſleeves from one opinion to the other, by either the one or the other. And whereas Mr. *Mountague* is made the man who firſt reformed King *James* his judgement, I offer it to conſideration, how probably it is aſſerted, when *An.* 1628. this Mr. *Mountague* then Biſhop, together

gether with Dr. *Neal* Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, being Remonſtrated to the King, as abetters of thoſe Tenets, and the King declaring diſlike of thoſe Novelties, both he and the other Biſhop; with tears in their eyes, proteſting, *they hated thoſe opinions*, and before his *Majeſty* and his *Councel* on their knees, renounced them. So Sr. *Humphrey Mildmay* averred in open Parliament 30 *Careli nomine contradicente*, No one neer the Chair contradicting.*

See the Additions.

Page. 25.

Fol. 6. *The Kings Corps on the* 4th. *of* May *was conveyed to Weſtminſter, and there inhumed &c.*] *Our Author tells us in the end of his Preface, what a ſpecial care he hath of his temporalitie; and yet he failes us here in the firſt beginning. For neither was the body of the King interred on the* 4th. *of* May, *nor the letters of procuration kept undelivered until the* 8th. *nor the Marriage Celebrated after the Funeral of the King. For upon* Sunday, May *the firſt, &c.*

Anſwer. That the 4th. of *May* was put for the 7th. is confeſt to be a miſtake; and it muſt be either in the Printer, or, a meer clip of my pen, for that I intended it ſo; I have theſe reaſons to perſwade the contrary. Firſt, all my informations, not one (and four they were) diſſenting fixt, the Kings interment on the 7th. and I were a mad Hiſtorian, to vary in ſo impertinent a matter, from thoſe informations. Secondly, my mentioning that that ſolemnity would be paſt *May* the 8th. may probably imply, I intended to aſſign the 7th. for it, for elſe the 5th. day had been more proper. But this is not all, I am miſtaken alſo in the celebration of the marriage; which though at firſt deſigned to be on the 8th. as I am able infallibly to demonſtrate, was as I am now informed, on the firſt of *May* as we account. So that two errours are in point of temporality here acknowledged.

Page. 27.

Fol. 7. *From* Canterbury *his Majeſty took Coach for* Whitehall *where the third day after his arival*] *If our Author meaneth by this, that their Majeſties went in Coach but ſome part of the way only, he ſhould then have ſaid ſo, their Majeſties paſſing no further then* Graves end, *and from thence went by water in their Royal Barges, &c.*

Anſwer. What I meant here any ordinary capacity may know, which is able to diſcern the difference between the taking Coach *to*, and for *Whitehal*.

Page. 28.

Fol. 8. *For as a man is without a female conſort, ſo to a King without*

without his ſupream councel an half-form'd ſteril thing] *Our Author in theſe words, and the reſt that follow, maintains a Paradox moſt dangerous to ſupream Authority, in making Parliaments ſo neceſſary to all Acts of State, as if Kings could do nothing without their conſent.*

Anſwer. I hope no man of any ingenuity, will interpret me here or elſewhere, an enemy to Monarchy; or doth ſo much as queſtion but that my *Politique Deſcendants* imply Statute-laws, which I am of opinion, no *King* of England hath power to make without common conſent in Parliament.

Page. 36.

Fol. 17. *And who* (i. e. *Sr.* Robert Manſel) *had an unqueſtionable right to the cheif conduct of this enterpriſe upon the Dukes default*] *I believe not ſo.*

Anſwer. The Obſervators contrary beliefe is no *evidence*, who was never made an *Arbitrator* in the buſineſſe; nor is it to others ſo ſtrange a thing; many men of wiſedom, and long experience, ſtill holding it for a *Rule*, not onely in this particular, but in all ſuch as have *vicariam poteſtatem*, a *vicegerency.*

Page. 37.

Fol. 20. *And the firſt thing reſolved upon was his ſolemn Initiation into Regality &c.*] Obſervator. *As ſolemn as the King eſteemed it, yet our Author as it ſeems, thinks more poorly of it; for he cenſureth it for a* vanity, *and thinks that kings are idle in it. Are not all Chriſtian Kings concerned in this? &c.*

Anſwer. Why I call this *Inauguration* a *ſerious vanity*, I declare the Reaſon; becauſe *it conferreth no one dram of ſolid grandure to the Throne*, Kings being perfect Kings, and qualifyed fully to all intents of Royality without it. Will the Obſervator deny this? if ſo, let him conſult the Lord Chancellor *Egertons Poſtnati*, where he ſhall find the ſame aſſerted: Yet leſt ſome ſuch *Cavillers* ſhould quarrel at my inclination, I added *ſerious* to it, importing there was ſomewhat in it of ſolid ſignification. Nor are all Chriſtian Kings concerned in this. His Catholick Majeſty of Spain, is not ſo much as touched, who is not Crowned at all.

Page. 39.

Fol. Ibid. *The Lord Keeper* Williams *was diſplaced, and his place diſpoſed of to Sr.* Thomas Coventry] Obſervator. *Our Author is here out again in his* Temporalities; *for the great Seal was taken from him in* October, *three months before. The like miſtake he proves in his* Temporalities, *touching Biſhop* Laud *whom*

he make Biſhop of Bath *and* Welles; *who was then Biſhop of St.* Davids.

Anſwer. The fall of Lord Keeper *Williams*, I never ſay'd or intended to be in that moment of time, to which that Paragraph relates; but principally purpoſing to deliver therein his and others excluſion from the Parliament, I mentioned alſo his fall as a thing preceding, and no way concurring with the other. So I was not out in this *Temporality*; but if I was not, I am afraid I know who is, in affirming [the great Seal was taken from him in *October*] whereas he parted with it in *Auguſt*, as Mr. *Howel* in his familiar letters, *Sect.* 4. *l.* 22. relates. But in making Dr. *Laud* Biſhop of *Bath* and *Welles* at that time, I confeſſe I was miſtaken, and this is *grande nefas*, an horrid crime no doubt. But, this is not all; for rather then he will not find another, the Obſervator fetcheth a running leap to *Fol.* 96. where ſpeaking of the *Articles* of *Lambeth*, it is ſaid [they were firſt ſent to the Synod of *Dort*, and after that to the Convocation of *Ireland*; a very ſtrange Hyſteron Proteron, Setting the *Convocation* of *Ireland* after the *Synod* of *Dort*, which preceded it three years; and this is ſomewhat more then ſuperannuating in his *Temporalities*] *Anſwer.* I write the *Hiſtory of the Reign of King Charles*, and then what I ſaid of that ſuperannuating, was by me intended (nor can it be rationally interpreted otherwaies) of ſuch things and actions as have reference to the ſixteen years whereof I treat in that Hiſtory, not of ſuch things as antecedently occurr'd, & are taken in by the *By:* for I have oft occaſion to mention things of preceding date, as in the caſe of the *Scottiſh* Preſbytery, wherein though I am guided by the beſt informers I had, yet will I not, nor did ever ſo mean, to warrant the truth thereof, as to every particular year. So it fareth in this errour, in point of precedency between a *Convocation* and a *Synod*; whereof to raiſe a queſtion is only to ſtrive *de Lana Caprina*, and is at worſt μνημονικὸν ἀμάρτημα, but a meer laps of memory; a thing as obvious, ſo withal excuſable in the beſt *Authors* in point of circumſtance; in ſuch an one eſpecially as this, wherein (as being extravagant, and out of the bounds of the Principal Narrative) curioſity was leſſe concerned. And this is I hope enough to keep this errour within the bounds of my *confidence of not ſuperannuating*, were the errour infallibly mine own. But if now after all this ranting triumph, upon a *melius inquirendum*, and better ſearch, the errour ſhould prove none of mine, would not the Obſervator, think you Reader, be wondrous blank at his *Ridiculus Mus.* Reſort to, and Review the place; then tell me, whither or not in your unbyaſt ſenſe, That Paragraph with the former, and three ſubſequent to it, do

not

not, or were not ſo intended, to compleat the report of the Committee for Religion. If ſo, then my information hath wronged me, or I my information. Now for my wronging my information (for I muſt walk circumſpectly, ſo many ſnares being laid to entrap me) take this ingenuous account. As for this report, it being very long, I thought fit to contract it into a narrow ſcantling, not minding the words, ſo I ſecured the ſubſtance. And if I have fail'd in this, if I have delivered any thing material, which thoſe Journals will not own, let me ſuffer; and to ſpeak here to the purpoſe, I appeal to Mr. *Pym* his ſpeech *Jan.* the 27. in thoſe Journals, where my Coppy (though erroneouſly I grant) preſents theſe Articles ſent to *Dort*, before *Ireland*; ſo much in defence of my not ſuperannuating in this particular. Now I come to relieve my Preface out of the Obſervators *Purgatory*, which hath tortured it ſufficiently, by ſaying *I am confident I ſtand ſecure, not only from ſubſtantial falſhoods, but from circumſtantial alſo*; whereas this is *his Preface*, not mine; for *male dum recitat*, the property is alter'd ſaith the *Epigrammatiſt*, my words being expreſly theſe, *Confident I am, I ſtand ſecure againſt any ſubſtantial falſhoods*; and I hope (now that 'tis no more then *I hope*) *againſt circumſtantial alſo.* ϕῶ τῆς ἀναισθήτου. Phy impudent Obſervator, reliſh it as you pleaſe; for *cum dixeris quod vis, audies quod non vis*, if you will take upon you thus, *garrire per angulos & de mundo ferre ſententiam*, to ſneak behind noon, and there give judgment upon all the world; you muſt look when you fail and forge ſo fouly, to be told of it to your teeth.

Page. 41.

Fol. 21. *Who loved the Biſhop if fame belies her not, better then was fit*]Obſervator. *I think our Author with more prudence might have ſpared this note, eſpecially having Fame onely for the ground thereof, which is ſo infamous an Hiſtorian.*

Anſwer. True it is, Fame is not alwaies an infallible informer, ſome Rumors being begot by *Malice*, and nurſed up by *Credulity*: But yet true it is, that ſhe is ſometimes a Publique Teſtimony: and the wiſe *Tacitus*, though he erects no Hiſtorical ſtructures upon her bare affidavit, yet doth preſent her in the like concernments, for an Author of a ſecond Admiſſion. How far ſhe ſtands guilty of the crime of Defamation in reference to that Lady, I liſt not to enquire. Sure I am Mr. *Wilſons Eunuchus ab utero* was a clearer acquitance of that Ladies Innocence, then any Argument by the Obſervator produced; and I muſt tell him it ſeemeth not at all ridiculous to any one who had a more inward knowledge of that Prelates condition. Mr. *Wilſon* went indeed too far in the ex-

traction of Biſhop *Williams* his impotency which was not *ab Utero* from the womb, but contracted after when he was a boy by falling upon a ſtake; whereof the Obſervator may be further aſſured, pleaſe he to enquire.

Page. 48.

Fol. 45. *For the* Lords *found an antient Order, that no Lords* ſedente Parliamento, *ſhould have voice during that Seſſion &c. whereupon their ſuffrage was excluded*] Obſervator. *I ſomewhat doubt our Authors intelligence in this particular.*

Anſwer. Matters of fact muſt not be born down with I believe, or I conceive; if the Obſervator can from the records themſelves demonſtrate my errour, I recant.

Page. 51.

Fol. 64. *But all would not ſmooth the aſpirity of this illegal* Tax] Obſervator. *The money which was then required of the Subject, was not impoſed in the way of* Taxe, *but a Loan.*

Anſwer. Taxe in common ſpeech is taken for a *Compulſory Tribute*, impoſed upon the Subject, at a certain rate; and ſuch a Taxe this Loan was, it being ſo cumpulſory, as the refuſers were by ſpecial inſtructions bound over to the *Councel-board* and impriſon'd.

Page. 55.

Fol. 71. *And a Commiſſion granted by the King to five Biſhops,* B. Laud *being of the* Quorum, *to execute Archi-Epiſcopal Juriſdiction. The cauſe impulſive to it was a ſuppoſed irregularity &c.*] Obſervator. *In this and the reſt which followeth, our Author runs himſelf into many errours. Firſt, Biſhop* Laud *was not of the* Quorum, *no more then any of the other. Secondly, the irregularity ſuppoſed, was not touched upon in the Commiſſion. Thirdly, it was not his keeper but the Lord* Zouches *he kill'd in* Bramhil Park, *&c.*

Anſwer. What four errours at a clap? that's ill luck; yet it was well they proved no more, for he that made them four, might have made them by the ſame art of juggling his words into my Text, four hundred. Let him keep his own ſuppoſitiçious foyſtings at home, my errours will not multiply ſo faſt. Now firſt, where did I ſay Biſhop *Laud* was of the *Quorum* more then any other? of the *Quorum*, I ſaid he was, meaning that of the five he was *one*. Secondly, where did I ſay that the Irregularity was expreſſed in the Cõmiſſion, as the impulſive to it? I ſaid it was the declared impulſive to the Commiſſion, and if it was not, or theſe had been any other, the Obſervator ſhould have done well to have diſcover'd. * Laſtly, whereas *I* ſaid the Archbiſhop *kill'd his Keeper*, Mr. *Prynn* in his Brevians

* See the *Additions.*

vians of Archbiſhop *Lauds* life, *p.* 11. and *Aulives Coquinariæ*, p. 130. expreſly ſay it was *his Keeper*. My laſt errour is the vouching *Biſhop Andrews* for a vindicator of the Archbiſhops Regularity. The Obſervator yeelds [he did the *Archbiſhop* great ſervice in this buſineſſe, but not for any opinion which he had, that no irregularity was incurred by that miſadventure.] Really Biſhop *Andrews* is beholding to the Obſervator for this note, the whole ſcope of that Commiſſion was to inquire into the matter of fact, and to reſolve whither the *Archbiſhop* (notwithſtanding that miſchance) was *Regular* or not *Regular*. This Biſhop with Sir *Henry Martin*, poſitively maintain'd that he was *Regular* ſtill; now if acting as a Commiſſioner from the *King*, he would poſitively maintain one thing, and in his own judgement adhere to the contrary, as the Obſervator poſitively ſaith he did, I ſay the more too blame he, and the much more too blame the Obſervator if he doth in this particular belye him, as 'tis an hundred to one he doth. But if the Biſhop pronounced the Archbiſhop *Regular*, though he thought otherwaies, what was then the plot? the Obſervator tells us it was to keep out Dr. *Williams* then Biſhop of *Lincoln*, and Lord *Keeper*, &c. who would have ſtept into that *See*. So then it ſeems the queſtion was not whither *Regular* or *Irregular*, but who, *Abbot* or *Williams*, would make the beſt Archbiſhop. This is fine ſtuffe, pitty it is, there is no more of the remnant.

Page. 58.

Fol. 73. *They who lately were confind as Priſoners, are now not only free, but Petty Lords, and Maſters, yea and Petty Kings.*] Obſervator. *I cannot choſe but marvail what enduced our* Author *unto this expreſſion of making the Gentlemen aſſembled in the houſe of Commons, not onely* petty *Lords, but* Petty Kings; *I have heard that King* James *once ſaid in a time of Parliament (but whither in way of jeer, or otherwaies, I am not able to ſay) that there were now five hundred Kings, beſide himſelf.*

Anſwer. King *James* having ſaid the like before, it is no great *marvail* that a poor Subject ſhould uſe the ſame expreſſion, conſidering what the Obſervators *Court-Hiſtorian* (as he, and Dr. *Heilen* uſually ſtiles him) ſaith, *Non ibi* conſiſtant *exempla, unde* (ſo it is not *ubi*, by his favour) *cæperunt*] Examples are not reſtrained to their firſt Originals. Nor did that expreſſion import what theſe Gentlemen were *de jure*, but what in reputation, and what *de facto*, and of this experience hath taught us, they lately were not *Petty Lords*, but *Lords Paramount*; not *Petty Kings*, but *Superiours* to Kings themſelves.

Page. 59

Page. 59.

Fol. 75. *Their Eſtates modeſtly eſtimated were able to buy the houſe of* Peers, *the King excepted, though an hundred and eighteen thrice over*] Obſervator. *Aſſuredly the Baſonage were brought very low when the Gentlemen aſſembled in the houſe of Commons could buy them thrice over, there being not above* 500 *of the one, and thrice one hundred and* 18, *that is to ſay, three hundred and fifty of the other, by which account every Gentleman muſt be able to buy his two Lords and an half one with another. But why doth our Author leave out the Biſhops, &c. It was ill done of him to exclude them, and not well done of him that ſhould have kept them in, to exclude them afterward, &c.*

Anſwer. All that I can make out of this account is, that it will take two ſuch Obſervators and an half to make up one good *Arithmetician.* The Computation is not ſo over-difficult but any one of ſlender skill may ſum up, and proportion it. The number of *Peers* being 118 allow to every *Peer* 3000 *l. per annum*, the total is 354000 *l.* multiply this by 3, there ariſeth 1062000 *l.* The Commoners the Obſervator grants to be five hundred; allow to every Commoner 2124 *l. per annum*, the product will be 1062000 *l.* ſo then every *Peer* conſidered at 3000 *l.* and every Commoner at 2124 *l. per annum*, no ſuch ſtupendious buſineſſe, if it be withal taken for granted, that for eſtates they were the gallanteſt aſſembly that ever thoſe walls immured; then I ſay the *Commons* were able to buy the houſe of *Peers* thrice over. Now for omitting the *Biſhops*, I demand what were they? members of the houſe of *Peers*, or are they not? if the firſt, then theſe words are turn-key enough to let them in; if the Obſervator ſay not, their excluſion is his own manufacture. Next to come to the man, who did ſo ill when he ſhould have kept them in, to exclude them: This man is King *Charles*, the very ſame I aſſure you, *ſed dicere muſſat*, would he ſpeak out, and exclude them; true it is he did [out of a firm perſwaſion of their contentedneſſe to ſuffer a preſent diminution in their Rights and Honour for his ſake] ſo are his very words. And I dare anſwer for almoſt all (for all I dare not; *non omnes Epiſcopi Epiſcopi ſunt*) they were for his ſake well contented; and if ſo, the greater indignity it is for this *Canis Palatinus* this *Court-curre*, a fellow ſo unconcerned therein, now his Royal back is turned, to be ſnarling at his heels for it. But of ſuch men this Nation hath enow, and to ſpare. *I* well remember being once at *Table*, our number being about a dozen, at that time when *ſomebody* was in a flouriſning condition in *Scotland*, ſeveral diſcourſes paſſing in reference to his affairs, amongſt other things a report

port was mentio ned, that in order to his eſtabliſhment he promiſed the *Covenanters* a ſettlement of the *Presbyerian* government, whereto one Reply'd [If he complie with the *Preſbyterians*, it is not this bit of bread to me whither he ſinke or ſwim] ſo ſtrong an influence had *Epiſcopacy* upon his Spirit, and poſſibly not *Epiſcopacy* neither; for it is ſhrewdly to be ſuſpected that ſome ſtand not ſo much upon that *Hierarchy*, in reference to the Churches ſplendor, as to their private Ambition. *Fac me Epiſcopum Romæ, & ero protenus Chriſtianus*, Make me Biſhop of *Rome*, & then I will turn Chriſtian, ſaid a flouting *Pagan* to *Damaſus*. And if *Fac me Epiſcopum, make me a Biſhop*, be not the *terminus ad quem*, the main ſcope of ſome Prelatical Regaliſts, they are honeſter men then I take them to be.

Page. 64.

Fol. 90. *He ſtitched a paper in the lining of his hat wherein he declared &c.*] Obſervator. *I think he is ſomewhat out in ſhort, there being nothing found in his hat or elſewhere about him; a few looſe papers ſuch as might become thoſe men who make God the Author of ſin.*

Anſwer. My informer is Captain *Harvey* (one of thoſe to whoſe cuſtody by order of the Lord *Carlton*, *Felton* was firſt committed) who in a letter that very 23 of *Auguſt*, wherein beſide other things formerly obſerved, he hath alſo this paſſage, that *Felton* told him he was to be prai'd for the next day (being *Sunday*) at *London* in a Church (meaning St. *Brides*) at *Fleetſtreet Conduit*, and in the end concludes his letter (having formerly related, his Motive to the fact, was, the *Remonſtrance* of the Houſe of Parliament) thus; He ſewed a writing into his hat, within the lining, to ſhew the cauſe why he put this cruel act in execution. The writing was thus even for a ſyllable.

> I would have no man commend me for doing it, but rather diſcommend themſelves; for if God had not taken away their hearts for their ſins, he had not gone ſo long unpuniſhed.
>
> *John Felton.*

> The man is cowardly baſe in mine opinion, and deſerves neither the name of a Gentleman or Souldier, that is unwilling to ſacrifice his life, for the honour of God, his King, and Country.
>
> *John Felton.*

Page. 68.

Fol. 94. *The body was from thence convey'd to* Portſmouth, *and*

& there hung in chains, but by ſome ſtole and convey'd away, Gibbet and all.] Obſervator. *Our Author is deceived in this; for I both ſaw the Gibbet ſtanding, and ſome part of the body hanging on it about three years after.*

Anſwer. That it was confidently ſo reported (though erroneouſly, as I am ſince informed by the Obſervators betters) I have good Authority to prove, and that will be ſufficient for me; nor is it any great wonder, when we conſider how ready and diſpoſed Fame is to unwarantable ſuperfætation.

Page. 70.

Obſervator. *The calling in of Mr.* Mountagues *book, and the advancing of Dr.* Barnaby Potter (*a through-paced* Calvinian) *unto the Biſhoprick of* Carlile, *could not get him any love in the hearts of his People.*

Anſwer. This muſt neceſſarily ſignifie ſomething of abominable quality in either the *Perſon*, or *Doctrine* of Dr. *Potter*, or both; to be ſo efficacious to obſtruct and *impede* the affection of his people. As for the man, know it is his eminent Relation to his Majeſty, might rather create a wonder why he was advanced ſo late, then why ſo ſoon; and to imagine any thing tending to ſcandal in his life, conſidering his place of ſo neer admiſſion to the King perſon, will at the firſt ſight, look ſo like a *Calumny*, as deſerves no anſwer. So then the horrid thing in him is, and muſt be his *Opinion*, and being a *through-paced Calvinian*; and that indeed is blemiſh enough now a daies; he that is ſo, be he the greateſt Scholler in the Land, he doteth; Be he the moſt pious, he is an hypocrite; be he the moſt conſciencious in all his Actions, a very knave; with all theſe titles of honour, I have known the gallanteſt men in this Nation dubb'd; and what is this but to make a faction of an opinion, and to contend for victory with the loſſe of Charity? The inſtitution of *Cyrus* makes ἀληθεύειν ſpeaking truth, one of the three accompliſhments of a compleat man; Chriſtiany goes further; and therefore the Apoſtles rule is, we muſt ſearch for truth and ſpeak it, but *in love*, that is, *keeping the unity of the ſpirit in the bond of Peace.* This unity of love, muſt be preſerved even where there is not an unity of faith in things not fundamental, which I take not one of thoſe controverſies to be; and if they be not ſo, it is a moſt ſad thing for the Church of God to be torn and rent in the entire cloth with diverſities of ſuch opinions, whoſe truths will neither carry us to Heaven, nor errours to hell; what the uncharitable animoſities on both ſides may produce I tremble to think. It was St. *Auguſtines* opinion, and I wiſh it entertain'd by our whole

Epheſ. 4. 15. ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ.

Auguſtine Epiſt. 162.

whole Church in ſuch Polemick queſtions as theſe, *Laudandi ſunt qui pro bono veritatis tolerant, quod bono veritatis oderunt.* [they are to be commended who for Chriſtian verities ſake patiently endure what they would elſe diſlike for the avail of Truth.] To proceed.

Page. 70.

Fol. 96. *For Arminianiſm informations were very pregnant, that notwithſtanding the Reſolution of the Archbiſhop of* Canterbury, *and other Reverend Biſhops and Divines aſſembled* Anno. 1595. *&c.*] Obſervator. *Why* man, *the Articles of* Lambeth *were never looked upon as the Doctrine of the Church of* England, *nor intended to be ſo looked upon by them that made them.*

Anſwer. Why *Man*, who ſaid they were? not I; it was Mr. *Pym*, and the Committe for Religion ſaid ſo. I do but recite what that Committe declared as the product of their inquiries: and with this anſwer legible enough to any who can read, I might eaſily avoyd no leſſe then 25 pages of the Obſervator. So that I might juſtly have this *Man in the Moon*, like *Mithridates* his ſoldiers, fighting by *Moon-ſhine* with his own ſhaddow; Had he not ſcattered my particulars in my way which detain me.

Firſt, Stating the occaſion of making the *Lambeth Articles*, he ſaith, *page.* 74. That the Compilers of the book of *Articles*, and the book of *Homiles*, the publique Monuments of our Church in point of Doctrine differ'd from *Calvines* ſince, in the point of Predeſtination and its ſubordinates.] *Anſwer.* This is very probable; for it is very rare for two ever of the ſame party to agree exactly in all parcels of theſe controverſies. But if they did in ſome things vary in opinion, I am ſtill to demand, *Quorſum hoc*, what then?

Secondly, *Page.* 74. He ſaith of *Petrus Baro*, at the end of his three firſt years, he relinquiſhed the Profeſſorſhip, and retired not long after into *France.*] *Anſwer.* Three errours in not full ſo many lines. Firſt, *Petrus Baro* relinquiſht not his Profeſſorſhip at the end of his firſt three years. He was Profeſſor *Anno.* 1574. his Lectures upon *Jonas* tells us ſo. And the Obſervator will have him Profeſſor about the time of the *Lambeth Articles*, which were in 1595. So then he relinquiſht his place not at the end of his firſt three years. Secondly, his firſt three years are manifeſtly miſtaken for two. For by the Statutes of the Lady *Margaret*, Foundreſſe of that Profeſſorſhip, every Profeſſor is eligible at the expiration of two, not of three years. The preciſe words are, *Et volumus inſuper quod de cætero quolibet Bienmio, ultimo die ceſſationis cujuſlibet termini ante magnam vacationem univerſitatis prædictæ, una habilis, apta*

& idonea perſona in lectorem lecturæ prædictæ, pro uno Biennio integro, viz. *a feſto nativitatis B.* Mariæ *Virginis tunc proximè ſequente duntaxat duraturo eligatur.* Fol. 105. *in nigro codice.* This I thought fit to inſert for the information of very many of a contray belief. Thirdly, *Peter Baron* never went or retired into *France* after the Reſignation of his Profeſſorſhip, but went up to *London*, to *Crutched Friers*; there he lived, there he dyed, and was buried in St. *Olaves* Church, at whoſe Interrment the Biſhop of *London* Ordered all the moſt eminent Divines, Miniſters in that *City*, to be preſent. Of this I hope I am credibly informed from his own Son ſtill alive.

Thirdly, the Obſervator laboureth to diſcredit the Articles of *Lambeth*; by telling us a ſtory, perhaps a tale, of the Queen, the Lord *Burly*, and Archbiſhop *Whitgift* in reference to thoſe Articles. To which I anſwer, firſt, This ſtory was never heard of till the year and the reputed father thereof, is one *Aurelius* (not *Aurelius Auguſtinus*, nor *Petrus Aurelius* to be ſure) a *Kentiſh*-man, who was unborn when thoſe Articles were framed. Secondly, admit his relation true; that Aſſembly was neither the firſt, nor the Greateſt that have incurr'd a Præmunire.

Fol. 96. *By the prevalency of the Biſhops of* London *and* Wincheſter, *the Orthodox party were depreſſed, and the truth they ſerved was ſcarce able to protect them to impunity.*] Obſervator. *A very heavy charge, which hath no truth in it; for I am very confident that neither of theſe Biſhops, did ever draw any man within the danger of puniſhment in relation only to their Tenets in the preſent Controverſies, if they managed them with that prudence and moderation which became men ſtudiouſly addicted to the Goſpel of Peace.*

Anſwer. I fear then the fault will be in their Prudence; for that ſome were ſnibb'd for matters of like nature, & reſtrained from ſpeaking their conſciences, the ſame journals relate, Sir *Daniel Norton* and Sir *Robert Phillips* informing the Houſe, the one of Dr. *Moor*, the other of Dr. *Marſhal*, who both teſtify'd they were chid by that B. of *Wincheſter* for preaching againſt Popery, and commanded to do ſo no more.

Page. 80.

Ibid. *By the uncontrouled Preaching of ſeveral points tending and warping towards Popery by* Mountague, Goodman, Cozens *and others.*] Obſervator. *How again our Author is I think miſtaken; for neither* Mountague *nor* Cozens *were queſtioned for preaching any thing warping towards Popery*, &c.

Anſwer. All the error the Obſervator can here pick out, is in the word *Preaching*, which I confeſs ſhould have been *Publiſhing*,

liſhing, though both are ſometime of the ſame, never of a much differing import; And though I ſhall agree with the Obſervator, that in Dr. *Cozens* his *Horary* there is no direct Popery; yet might it raiſe jealouſies of his tendency that way, conſidering the time wherein he publiſhed it. But ſeeing that Doctor hath appeared of late a ſtout advocate for the Reformed Church, as I was firſt informed by my Reverend friend Mr. *Lionel Gatford*, and am now further aſſured by others, I wiſh all men would indulge him a favourable conſtruction of that his right-hand Error. Charity to himſelf as Chriſtian, and to the unity of this diſtracted Church, requires no leſs.

Page. 85.

Obſervator. *That Adoration towards the Altar or Eaſtern part of the Church, was generally uſed by the beſt and moſt religious Chriſtians in the Primitive Times, Our Author, (if he be the man he is ſaid to be) being well verſed in the Monuments of moſt pure Antiquity cannot chuſe but know.*

Anſwer. Becauſe the Obſervator appeals here to my knowledg, though I boaſt not of any great knowledg of or acquaintance with the *Monuments of moſt pure Antiquity*, yet will I render both my ſcience and conſcience, and theſe apart from what I deliver as the Report of this *Committee*, who are of age to anſwer for themſelves. True it is that bodily Adoration, and worſhipping towards the Eaſt, was an ancient cuſtome of the Primitive Church; evidence thereof there is enough in Eccleſiaſtical writers. As it was ancient, ſo can I not ſay it was illaudable in them, and might be tolerable in us, as I conceive, were all men ſatisfied in the *decorum* of it, or a liberty left to thoſe who are ſtill dubious of the lawfulneſſe thereof to forbear it. But for dopping or cringing to, or towards the *Altar* or holy Table, as oft as they approached to, or retreated from it; (which is I take the *bowing* meant by the Committee, and was oft practiſed by ſome indiſcreet pretenders to conformity with the Primitive Church) I profeſſe ſeriouſly I find not the leaſt trace thereof in any genuine Author of the firſt 500 yeares; and ſuppoſe I did, yet would not that be exemplary enough to me to imitate their practiſe. The Primitive Fathers never intended their uſages or expreſſions ſhould be leading Charts, or Directories to all poſterity; they knew wel enough that ceremonies, phraſes & modes of ſpeech, muſt comply with, & humour the temper of their reſpective times, places, and other like circumſtances. Their Prieſts, Altars, Sacrifices were at firſt words of an innocent import, and pious intendment; but became afterwards, in

proceſs of time, the main turn-keys to the ſuperſtitious Sacrifice of the Maſſe, and the ſupporters of Tranſubſtantiation; and though Great ſcholars who know moſt properly how to apply them, may ſometime take the ſame liberty the Fathers uſed, yet ſeeing the Idolatry of worſe times hath impoſed upon thoſe words a ſenſe differing from their primitive reception, reaſon good in common ſpeech they ſhould be forborn. *Ne propter ambiguitatem vocabuli quam non diſcernit quotidiana locutio, illud profiteri videatur, quod eſt inimicum nomini Chriſtiano.* Leaſt by reaſon of the ambiguity of a word not ſo eaſily diſcerned in ordinary diſcourſe, ſomething may ſeem to be intended not conſonant to Chriſtian faith] as *Auguſtine* excellently in another, though not unlike, caſe: So that the Primitive practice is in my opinion no general rule to goe by. I proceed to the next ceremony faulted by the Committee, the ſtanding up at *Gloria Patri*. Concerning this the Obſervator ſaith firſt [It was never obtruded I am ſure] *Anſwer*, what never? Let him not be too confident, for really I fear there will prove a flaw in his aſſurance, who ſo ever was of his Councel. For in Biſhop *Wren's* Articles framed for the Dioceſſe of *Norwich*, ſure I am, *cap.* 4th. there are theſe words [Do they (*i.e.* the People) at the end of every *Pſalm* ſtand up and ſay, Glory be to the Father, *&c.*] Now I think things inquired after in Dioceſan viſitations may be ſaid to be urged and obtruded. But if it was not obtruded by the Biſhops, the more negligent, the more too blame they; for the Obſervator tels us Secondly, [The *Rubrique* of the Church requiring us to ſtand up at the *Creed*, obligeth us by the ſame reaſon to ſtand up at the *Goſpels* and *Gloria Patri*, the *Goſpels* being the foundation of the *Creed*, as *Gloria Patri* is the Epitome and abſtract of it] Now ſay *I*, if the *Rubrique* obliged us to uſe this ceremony, it did alſo oblige the Biſhops to enforce conformity to it: and the Obſervators excuſe is their accuſation. But this Theologaſter ſaying that *Gloria Patri* is an Epitome of the *Creed*, tells us newes indeed. For of what *Creed I* demand? of that (the Apoſtles) at which the *Rubrique* enjoyned us to ſtand up? ſurely no ſuch thing. *It* is in truth as Mr. *Hooker* quoteth out of St. *Baſil*, ἀπόδειξις τῆ ὀρθῆ φρονήματος, the evidence of a right ſenſe in the doctrine of the *Trinity*; and not in all concernments of that Doctrine neither, but only in the particular of *Coequality* of the three Perſons. Now there are in the *Creed* other points beſides relating to the Trinity, and ſome Articles not at all belonging to that Doctrine. So that this Doxology muſt be ſtretched beyond all reaſon to comprehend them.

Epiſt. 200. *Aſellic.*

Thirdly, he ſaith that [Many a thing may be retained in a Reformed

Reformed Church, without ſpecial Rubriques to direct them, *ex vi Catholicæ conſuetudinis*, eſpecially where there is no rule to the Contrary.] *Bene, bene, ſed quo iſtud tam bene?* much truth, but to little purpoſe. For will the *Obſervator* ſay; we have no Rule to the contrary? If he doth, he muſt be tranſmitted to the Act for uniformity prefixt to our *Leiturgy*, where there is a *væ*, a woe to him who [ſhall wilfully uſe any other Rite or Ceremony, &c. then is ſet forth in the book of *Common-Prayer*] expreſly binding all men to a ſtrict conformity to the very letter of it.

Fourthly, He ſaith [there is no more Authority for ſtanding up at the Goſpel, then at *Gloriâ Patri*] *Anſwer.* Reaſon there is more I am certain, and I believe more Authority. As for Reaſon, Standing is the moſt proper poſture of attention; and if any part of Scripture requireth attention, the Goſpel doth it in a moſt eminent degree, the reading whereof is τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνοιξις, the ſetting of Heaven gates wide open, not with the Pſalmiſt *for the King of Glory to come in*, but for the King of Glory to come forth. Now as ſtanding is not improper, ſo is it not a poſture peculiar to the action of Doxology, and glorifying of God, as is evident by our Church, which ſometimes (as in our Communion ſervice) requireth it from our knees. Next I come to Authority, which I ſay did poſitively injoyn me and all men of my mind to ſtand up at the Goſpel, not ſo at *Gloria Patri.* For by the Canons, it is required of every man [when in the time of Divine Service the *Lord* [I think it ſhould be, *word* or name, as in the Queens Injunctions] Jeſus ſhall be mentioned] due & lowly reverence ſhall be done, as hath been accuſtomed; now how it hath been accuſtomed, the Queens Injunctions tell us expreſly, it was [by lowneſſe of curteſie, and uncovering of the head] By uncovering my head this reverence I cannot perform; for *Pileum* being *inſigne libertatis receptæ*, the cognizance of liberty, I think it becometh me not to have it on when my Lord and Maſter ſpeaks to me. So that my Reverence I muſt do by Genuflection and bowing of the knee, which cannot be done but in a Stationary poſture. And note further, that this Reverence is not only required by our Church, when the *Goſpel*, but alſo when the ſecondleſſon, yea when the *Epiſtle* (or *Apoſtle* as the antients call'd it) was read.

Chryſoſt. in Iſai. Hom. 2.

Page. 98.

Fol. 110. *There was an old ſkulking ſtatute long ſince out of uſe, though not out of force, &c.*] Obſervator. *This ſtatute was made in the firſt year of* Edward *the ſecond. But whereas our Author tells us that the perſons mention'd in that ſtatute were not required to be made Knights, as was vulgarly ſuppoſed, but* ad arma gerenda,

da, *to bear armes, and thereupon tells us a ſtory of a* Sword *and* Surcoate, *I ſhall rather believe the plain words of the Statute, then his interpretation.*]

Anſwer. I find by Sr *Edward Coke*, *Inſt. part ſecond*, that by the *Common-Law* all perſons who hold a *Knights Fee* (which was of uncertain value, ſometimes 15, ſometimes 20, ſometimes (as in this preſent caſe) 40 *l. per annum*) might be compell'd to be made *Knights*. That the *Kings* of *England* had this power before the *Stat.* 1. *Ed.* 2. it is evident by *Matthew Paris*, *pag.* 897. who relateth that *H.* 1. came into the *Exchequer*, & there fined all the Sheriffs of *England* five markes a man, for not diſtraining *Quemlibet habentem*, *&c.* [Every one having 15. pounds *per annum*, to be made Knights as he commanded by his writs directed to thoſe Sheriffs.] And the like precept was ſent out by *Edward* 1. as is to be ſeen by *Matthew Weſtminſter*, *Flor. Hiſt. p.* 223. As to my ſtory of the *Belt* and *Surcoate*, the Author thereof (an eminent Antiquary) being long ſince dead, and not in being to make his defence, I ſhall offer ſomething out of my reading, tending that way in confirmation of that note. Firſt, for the time, that it was regularly to be at the *Coronation*, is inferrible from the inſtructions ſent down this year, with the Kings Commiſſion, whereby [Al ſuch Baronets as were not Knights at his *Coronation*, and all Knights who have received that honour ſince that time] are declared liable to make fine. As for the *Belt* and *Surcoate*, *Matthew Weſtminſter* tells us, *K. Ed.* 1. ſent forth a Proclamation, that all ſuch perſons, *Qui haberent unde militarent adeſſent apud Weſtmonaſter. &c.* Who had poſſeſſions valued at a Knights fee ſhould appear at *Weſtminſter*, *&c.* What to do? he tells you preſently, *admiſſuri ſinguli ornatum militatem ex regia garderoba*, *to receive military accoutrements out of the Kings Wardrobe.* But I ſaid, theſe men ſummon'd were *not to be made Knights, as was vulgarly ſuppoſed*, which words having reference to the preſent caſe, are no other in ſubſtance then what Sr. *Edward Coke* ſaid before me, who in the place forerecited ſpeaks clearly thus. [Now, *tempora mutantur*, the times are changed and many a yeoman purchaſeth lands in Knights ſervice, and yet (*non debet*) ought not, for want of Gentry, to be a Knight] and a little after, the fine to the Mark which is chiefly aimed at.

Page. 103.

Fol. 124. *For many had no fancy to the work, meerly becauſe he was the promoter of it*] Obſervator. *It was plainly contrary, his caſe in promoting it, being one great reaſon why ſo many had a fancy to it moſt of the Clergy contributing largely unto it; the like did moſt of the Nobility and Gentry.* *Anſwer.*

Anſwer. The Obſervator ſaith *moſt* of the Clergy, and *moſt* of the Nobility and Gentry contributed largely to the repairing of St. *Pauls*. *Many*, and *moſt*, may ſure be conſiſtent; there may be many oppoſite to the major vote.

Page. 106.

Fol. 126. *But the entertainment moſt of all Auguſt and Royal, was that of the Earl of* Newcaſtle *at* Welbech, *which was eſtimated to coſt the Earl not leſſe then* 6000 l.] Obſervator. *I have ſhewed our Author ſome miſtakes in his Temporalities, and now I ſhall ſhew him one or two in his localities, beſides his miſplacing of the battail of Tiſſique ſpoken of before. The entertainment ſo much talked of, which coſt the Earl* 6000 l. *was not made* 1633. *in the time of the King's going into* Scotland, *but* July *the laſt in the next year; nor was it made at* Welbech, *but at* Belſover Caſtle. *The like miſtake in matter of locality, occurreth* Fol. 129. *&c.*

Anſwer. The Obſervator here mentioneth a battail of *Tiſſique*, ſpoken of before; but where I know not; only conjecture that he had a good will to take me to taske for miſplacing a battail, I ſuppoſe at *Roſtoch*; but upon better conſideration he found the errour was his own, not mine; and therefore cut out the leaf containing the 101 & 102 *pages* wherein his miſtake lay, leaving that Paragraph tyed head and heeles together.

Now I come to my two errours in Locality. The firſt is my miſplacing of the Earl of *Newcaſtles* entertainment of the King. Which he will have at *Belſover Caſtle* in *Darby-ſhire*, not at *Welbech*: and not 1633. but the next year after; and why ſo? becauſe [that was the entertainment which coſt the Earl 6000 *l.*] I anſwer, mentioning the entertainment given the King by the Earl, I delivered theſe particulars. Firſt, that it was in his progreſſe into *Scotland*. Secondly, that it was the moſt *Auguſt* of all. Thirdly, that it was at *Welbech*. Laſtly, that it was eſtimated (not poſitively that it did ſo) to coſt the Earl 6000 *l.* The three firſt are granted for truth by the very Obſervator himſelf; and for the laſt, as I ſaid barely, it was ſo eſtimated, ſo I muſt tell him it was ſo eſtimated to my ſelf at *York* at that very time of the Kings Progreſſe, and a full year before the next entertainment was given or perhaps thought of.

The next miſtake in Locality, is, *Fol.* 129. where I relate that both their Majeſties, with their train of Court-Grandees and Gentlemen Revellers, were ſolemnly invited to a moſt ſumptuous banquet at *Guild-Hall*.] Whereas the entertainment which at that time the City gave the King was at Alderman

derman *Freman's* houſe. Herein I confeſſe my errour; *Parce precor falſo.*

Page. 110.

Fol. 127. *A very Learned man he was, his Erudition of the old ſtamp ſtiffy diſciplin'd in the doctrine of St.* Auguſtine, *which they who underſtand it not call* Calviniſme.] Obſervator. *Whereas Our Author makes the Doctrine of St.* Auguſtine *and* Calviniſme *to be all One, I think he is very much out in that. St,* Auguſtine *was a great maintainer of Epiſcopacy, which the* Calvinians *have rejected,* &c.

Anſwer. Good Reader, judge thou if I make the Doctrine of St. *Auguſtine* and *Calviniſme* to be in all concernments all one; in oppoſition to the *Maſſilian* and *Arminian* Tenets they are I both ſaid then, and dare ſay again, the very ſame or very neer. In ſome other points know *I* do they differ. The Obſervator inſtanceth in that of *Epiſcopacy*; how true that, *I* determine not; but in that of the *Sabath* or *Lords day* which is the next thing offers it ſelf to our conſideration, ſure *I* am they do.

Page: 112.

Fol. 128. *This Declaration then cauſed ſo many impetuous clamours againſt it, as it was ſoon call'd in.*] Obſervator. *In this I am ſure our Author is extremely Out; that Book being never call'd in, though the execution was ſoon deſcontinued.*

Anſwer. Out I may be, but ſure not extremely out, the diſcontinuance of the Execution of it being a tacite ſuppreſſing and calling of it in.

Page. 114.

Fol. 129. *The Divinity of the* Lords day *being new Divinity at Court.*] Obſervator. *And ſo it was by its favour in the Countrey too, not known in* England *till the year* 1595. *So new it is that it cannot preſcribe to* 60 *years; for if it could, we ſhould have found ſome mention of it in our Articles, or Our Book of* Homilies, *in which we find nothing at all touching the keeping of that day.*

Anſwer. By this and ſome other paſſages in the Obſervator, we may ſuſpect the man to be *Petrifi'd* (there's an hard word, as hard as a ſtone) and very converſant with *Peter Hielen* a Dr. of *Coſmography*, a work very proper for him; for none fitter to deſcribe the world then he, who all his life hath loved the world; none like him; but of that Dr. more anon. Next to the Obſervator, if that Dr. and he be two; Firſt, he ſaith that [the Divinity of the Lords day was not known in *England* till the year 1595.] If ſo, I demand of the Obſervator, what

what did Archbiſhop *Whitgift* mean in his defence of the Anſwer to the Admonition, *p.* 553. where ſpeaking in the preſent tenſe, he ſaith the Sabbath is ſuperſtitiouſly uſed by ſome? did he mean the Jewiſh Sabbath? that cannot be; for he ſubjoynes, ſo is the Church, the Creed, the Lords Prayer; importing it to be a lawful thing, abuſed by ſuperſtitious people; and ſoon after he ſpeaks of a Sabbath then commanded by the 4th. Precept, which could not be the Jewiſh; and if not that, muſt of neceſſity be the Lords day. Now this Archbiſhop publiſhed his Defence, *Anno.* 1574. Next for the book of Homiles, ſurely he ſpake much without book; for certainly there was not any thing more eſpecially taught in thoſe Homiles, then the divinity of the Lords day: they ſaying [God in that Precept (ſpeaking of the fourth) commandeth the obſervation of the Sabbath, which is our Sunday] What can poſitively be rendred clearer? Here's the Sabbath interpreted by the Lords day, and that commandeth to be obſerved in the 4th. Precept by God himſelf. So that by the Obſervators leave, the Divinity of the Lords day may be found in our book of Homilies.

Page. 115.

Fol. Ibid. *Which ſeemed the greater prodigy, that men who ſo eagerly cryed up their own Order and Revenues for Divine, ſhould ſo much deny the Lords day from being ſuch when they had no other Exiſtence then in Relation to this.*] Obſervator. *Here's a Prodigy indeed, and a Paradox too; that neither the Order nor Revenues of the Evangelical Prieſthood, have any exiſtence but in Relation to the Divinity of the Lords day. If our Author be not out in this, I am much miſtaken.*

Anſwer. Where hath this Obſervator been brought up, that this Tenet of mine, of mine ſaid I? yea of all learned men ſhould be ſo wondred at to be called a Prodigy? Good Reader when thou ſeeſt him next, tell him from me, there is ſcarce a man of note who treateth of the fourth Commandment, that owneth not this *Prodigious* opinion. I ſhall content my ſelf with only one at preſent, but one who I hope will be *inſtar omnium* with the Obſervator, as being free from Puritaniſm. The learned Biſhop of *Wincheſter*, who expounding the fourth Commandment, ſaith firſt, [becauſe men ſhould not be left at liberty when to perform Religious duties, God hath appointed a *Day* whereon to do them, and that more ſolemnly in a publique meeting or aſſembly] this Day, he calleth the *Lords Day.* Secondly [Now whereas the ſolemn duties of this *Day*, cannot be performed in a publique manner, without a *Place* ſet a part, and *Perſons* enabled to perform

Catechiſt. Doct. p. 259.

form ſuch ſacred actions. Therefore both *Places* & *Perſons* ſanctify'd to thoſe purpoſes, & *Maintenance* alſo for thoſe *Perſons*, are included in this Precept] ſo here are both the ſacred Orders and Revenues conſtituted in relation to the Lords Day, and the duties thereof; and emergent both from the fourth Commandment, and ſo I hope the Prodigy is at an end.

Page. 116.

Fol. Ibid. *But of this elſewhere.*] Obſervator. *And indeed of this there hath enough been ſaid elſewhere to ſatisfie all learned and ingenuous men both in the meaning of the law and in point of practice.*

Anſwer. Never any thing more truly ſpoken. And all I ſhall ſuperadde is this, that whereas I ſaid, *But of this elſewhere*, my meaning was, that of the Doctrine of the Sabbath or Divinity of the Lords day I had treated elſewhere, in a book extant of that Argument, *Anno.* 1640. never as yet anſwered by any. To that Treatiſe I refer all men who ſhall deſire my Judgment in that Subject. Only from thence I ſhall (having ſo fit an opportunity) be bold to re-mind Doctor *Heilen* of an od miſtake (to ſay no worſe) committed by him, in vindication whereof he never attempted any thing as yet; The miſtake this. The main queſtion concerning that Day was (and I am ſorry to find it is) whither or not it be of *Divine inſtitution*; That Doctor with his leaders and followers, ſaid nay; and (becauſe it would ſignifie the ſame thing, ſhould it be evinced to be *Apoſtolical*) the man ſweats, toyles, and ſomewhat worſe, to evade it. For *Part* 2.*c*.6.*s*. 7. of his Hiſtory of the Sabbath, he citeth out of *Pareus* his *Com.* in *Gen.* 2. treating of the change of the Sabbath into the Lords Day, theſe words; *Quomodo autem facta ſit hæc mutatio in ſacris literis non apparet.* And to make it apparent, he was induſtrious in it, becauſe *Quomodo* alone he thought *non vult fac*, would not do the deed without his Paraphraſe; he deſcants on it thus. *How?* that is *by, what Authority this change was made, appeareth not in ſacred Scripture*, whereas in very truth, *Pareus* his word, in two ſeveral Editions, one 4°. the other folio, is *Quando* (not *Quomodo*) & for the *Authority*, he in that very place aſcribes it *Apoſtolicæ Eccleſiæ*, to *the Apoſtolique Church*; and in Comment upon 1 *Cor.*16. *v.* 2. and upon the *Revelation*, fixeth it poſitively upon *Apoſtolical Authority*. Now what it is for a *Doctor* of *Divinity*, for ſo great a champion of *Antiquity* againſt *Novelty*, not in an idle circumſtance, but in the grand concernment of a controverſie, to forge and falſifye a Record ſo boldly, I dare not ſay ſo impudently, I ſubmit to the judgment of all the world. This I write partly to provoke an anſwer from that Doctor, and partly

partly, to vindicate him from the groundleſſe ſuppoſition, which renders him the Author of theſe *Obſervations*; who, as he hath profeſſedly diſavowed it, ſo is it ſcarce credible that he of all men, durſt be ſo bold with me, as this Obſervator is, knowing how readily I might have returned—— *Quis tulerit Gracchos*——

Page. 117.

Fol. Ibid. *And was after ſtiled Duke of* York] Obſervator. *Our Author here accomodates his ſtile to the preſent times, when the weekly Pamphlets gave the Prince no other Title then the* Titulary Duke of York. *It is true indeed the ſecond ſon of* England *is not born to the Dukedom of* York, *but receives that Title by creation, &c.*

Anſwer. How is it poſſible to eſcape the Obſervators laſh? Had I ſaid he was then ſtiled *Duke* of *York*, I had been out in my Temporalities, he being not created *Duke* of *York* till afterward: to avoy'd which *Scylla*, I inſerted *after*, and fell upon the *Charybdis* of *complying with weekly Pamphlets*; what ſhall an honeſt Hiſtorian do in ſuch a caſe?

Page. 122.

Fol. 131. *The King preſently iſſued out writs to all the Counties within the Realm.*] Obſervator. *Our Author is deceived in this, as in many things elſe; For in the firſt year of the Payments of Shipmoney the writs were not iſſued to all the Counties of* England, *but only to the maritime Counties, &c.*

Anſwer. This miſtake I acknowledge alſo. But did it deſerve ſo much favour as for the Obſervator to give me two for one? for firſt he ſaith, *in the firſt year of Shipmoney the writs were iſſued to the Maritime Counties*] No ſuch matter, it was to the maritine, to the *Port-townes* only. Secondly, he ſaith that in the next year, and not before, the like writs were iſſued out to the Counties in *England*, which is an undoubted truth; but whereas he gives us ſome more certain note of that year to be 1636. he is much out; for thoſe general writs were iſſued in the year 1635. as a conſequent of the opinion of the Judges in that *November*; and this is an undoubted truth alſo.

Page 125.

Fol. 132. *But in regard he came without* Credential letters *from the Queen of* Sweaden, *he denied him audience, whereupon he returned in ſome diſguſt*] Obſervator. *In this ſhort paſſage there are more miſtakes then lines. For firſt, it is not likely that yong* Oxonſtern *came without Credential letters. Secondly, I am ſure he had publique audience, my curioſity carrying me to the Court*

that day, not ſo much to ſee the formalities of ſuch receptions, as to behold the Son *of ſo wiſe a* Father, *&c.*

Anſwer. Never was any mans hand ſo out as mine in this Narration; what? more miſtakes then lines? that's ſad, if not ſomewhat hyperbolical, as is evident becauſe there are many lines, and but two miſtakes, taking the Obſervators information for currant. But be there more miſtakes then lines, I have a Father for them all. The Hiſtory of the Wars of Chriſtendome, The Author whereof, though he be an Italian, and therefore not ſo competent a Judge of our affaires; yet the Earle of *Monmouth*, who tranſlated him, was of our Nation, and a perſon of ſo much honour and knowledge in this buſineſſe, as he would have given us ſome Marginal caveat, had it been ſo wide of truth as the Obſervator would make it.

Page 245.

Page 130.

Fol. 137. *The King committing the ſtaff of that office to Dr.* Juxon *Lord Biſhop of* London; *who, though he was none of the greateſt Scholars, yet was withal none of the worſt Biſhops.*] Obſervator. *I would fain learn of our Author in what particular parts of either divine or humane learning he reckons this Biſhop defective.*]

Anſwer. That this *Biſhop* was none of the greateſt Schollars, I ſaw then no reaſon but that I might ſafely ſay, without diſparagement to his Function, Schollarſhip, or my Prudence; a Biſhop may be διδακτικὸς, able to inſtruct, and Schollar ſufficient for his *Place*, though he be none of the greateſt magnitude. Nor is it requiſite that a *Biſhop* be much more learned then a *Presbyter*: That he be more *prudent*, requiſite it is, being a quality more pertinent to Government; and in this particular, I hope I have made him an amends in the latter part of his Character. I ſhall conclude with *Hierome*, *Nullus aut rarus eſt qui omnia habeat, quæ habere debet Epiſcopus. No Biſhop, or rarely any hath all vertues belonging to a Biſhop*; and he who wanteth two or three, and hath all the reſt, is more commendable for what he hath, then to be blamed for what he wants: If this be not ſatisfaction enough, I hope that is, that I have ordered a *deleatur* upon it, being loth to abide a miſconſtruction; and finding the Hiſtorians note verified, *Vivorum ut magna admiratio, ita cenſura difficilis eſt.*

Adv. Pelagian. l. 1.

Page 133.

Fol. 138. *As the Archbiſhop, whilſt he ſo vehemently purſued Order, did a little outrun Authority, &c.*] Obſervator. *The King gave Authority and Approbation to it (a year before this Metropolitical Viſitation) in the caſe of St.* Gregories *in* London, *being*

being heard before him ſitting in the Privy Councel. Anno 1633.

Anſwer. The Archbiſhops out-running Authority I intended not in placing the Communion-Table *Altar-wiſe*, at the Eaſt-end of the Chancel; but by enjoyning a wooden traverſe of rails to be ſet before it, by commanding all Communicants thither to reſort for the Bleſſed Sacrament: Theſe I commend as decent in themſelves, but account as Innovations. I will give you now my reaſon, not quarrelling with Dr. *Coal*, whom the Biſhop of *Lincoln* carbonado'd, nor yet with *Peter Heylin*; plainly and ſincerely the 82 Canon enjoyneth, that the Communion-Table, when the holy Communion is to be adminiſtred [ſhall be placed in ſo good ſort within the *Church* or *Chancel*, as thereby the Miniſter may be more conveniently heard of the Communicants, and the Communicants alſo in more number may communicate with the ſaid Miniſter. Now the Communicants may both beſt hear, & in moſt number communicate, when the Table is in the body of the *Church*, or of the *Chancel*. Again, it is clear from the word *ſaving*, mention'd in this Canon, that the Table was to ſtand in one place when there was no Communion, and in another when there was one. And this is moſt clearly made out by the Queens Injunctions 1559. from whence this *Canon* in this particular is almoſt *verbatim* taken; for after order taken where it ſhall ſtand, in Communion-time, it is further ſaid in thoſe injunctions [And after the Communion done, from time to time the ſame holy Table to be placed where it ſtood before.] Infallibly implying, that though it ſtood Altar wiſe before, yet at Communion-time it was to be removed, and conſequently not to be raild in.

But behold how he defends this from Innovation, [the King gave Anthority and Approbation for it a year before the Metropolitical Viſitation I ſpeak of] Where's that? [in deciding the controverſie about the Communion-Table in the caſe of St. *Gregories* 1633.) This Metropolitical Viſitation, ſay I, was 1635. His Majeſties Declaration, ſayes the *Obſervator*, was 1633. *a year before*; ſure the man meanes *London meaſure*. But what? did the King declare any thing in that caſe, concerning the ſetting of rails before the *Holy Table*, or that it ſhould ſtand there immoveable, ſo as the Commnnicants were to reſort up to thoſe rails to receive? Sure I am that Declaration ſpeaks no ſuch matter, not a ſyllable tending that way: *Oportet eſſe memorem.* When theſe words fell from me, it ſeems *I* forgot what *I* ſaid before of the remiſſe government of Arch-Biſhop *Abbot* [which made the future reduction of tender-conſcienced men ſo long diſcontinued

tinued obedience, interpreted an innovation.] No ſuch matter, *I* well remembred thoſe words, and withal that *I* never meant they ſhould relate to the ſetting Rails before the Holy Table, ſo as it might not be removed at the time of celebrating the Bleſſed Sacrament.

Page 139.

Fol. 138. *They were not blameleſſe in their lives, ſome being vitious unto ſcandal.*] Obſervator. Vitious even to ſcandal! *That goes high indeed, and it had well become the Author to have named the men. Or were there ſuch, it had been fitter for our Author to have played the part of* Sem *and* Japhet, *in hiding the nakedneſſe of their Spiritual Father, then to act the part of* Cham, *in making Proclamation of it unto all the world,* &c.

Ad Ruffin. *Anſwer.* A true ſaying it is of St. *Hierome*: *Quando ſine nomine contra vitia ſcribitur, qui irascitur, accuſator ſui eſt.* When vices are declam'd againſt, and no perſons named, he who is angry, accuſeth himſelf: So that here the Obſervator may ſeem to ſave part of my labour, and names himſelf for one. And wiſh *I* doe, from my very ſoule, *I* were not able to add another; for the Obſervator himſelfe cannot more cordially rejoyce in the conviction of me here for untruth, then *I* would my ſelf, ſo much do *I* prefer the honour of the Clergy before mine own reputation.

But *were there ſuch, it had been fitter*, ſayes the Obſervator, *for our Author to have played the part of* Sem *and* Japhet, *in hiding, then of* Cham, *in making Proclamation of it to all the world.* Certainly no fitter for me then it was for *Chryſoſtome*, the *Greek* of whoſe golden mouth was, in relation to the vices of his times, as broad as is my *Engliſh* in reference to thoſe. No fitter for me then for *Gildas*, ſirnamed the wiſe, the moſt Ancient of our Britiſh Writers extant, to ſay, *Sacerdotes habet Britannia, ſed inſipientes; quam plurimos Miniſtros, ſed impudentes; clericos, ſed raptores ſubdolos, &c.* Great Britain hath Prieſts indeed, but ſilly ones; Miniſters of Gods word very many, but impudent; a Clergy, but given up to greedy rapine, *&c.*

No one of us all acting *Cham's* part, that is, making ſport with the failings of thoſe we ſhould reverence; but rather ſadly bewailing the Churches condition, in being burthen'd with ſuch unſanctify'd perſons; and for my ſelf, acting the part not of *Cham*, but of an Hiſtorian, Hiſtorie being not only γυναικὸς τῆς ἀξιολόγου ἀρετῆς, *the Repoſitorie of the vertues of Heroick Spirits*, but μάστιξ τῆς τῶν φαύλων κακίας, *the teſtimony of the vices of Bad men*, I thought I could doe no leſſe then take ſome notice of this exorbitancy of ſome of the Clergy; and that

that (as this Obſervators Court-Hiſtorian ſaith) *non ut arguerem, ſed ne arguerer*, not ſo much that I might accuſe them, as fearing leſt I ſhould be accuſed my ſelfe for omitting them. *Patercl. l. 2.*

Page 141.

Fol. *Ibid. He was bold to ſay, he hoped to live to ſee the day when a Miniſter ſhould be as good a Man as any Jack-Gentleman in* England.] Obſervator. *Our Author telling us this Man was an high* Flyer, *he gives us ſome conjecture at the Man he drives at. A Man of an undaunted ſpirit, and ſtrong reſolutions, but not ſo intemperate in his Words, or unwiſe in his Actions, as to ſpeak ſo contemptuouſly of our Engliſh Gentry.*

Anſwer. The Obſervator hath, I believe, a probable conjecture at this high-Flyer; but as to his vindication of him from ſuch diſtemper in his words or actions, I fear his word will ſcarce be taken. The truth is, it ſeems my information was not then ſo good as ſince; therefore I have now corrected that expreſſion according to that Authors own copy, adding *upſtart* to Jack-Gentleman; which argues, I think, not much of the temper or wiſedome the Obſervator cries up in him.

Page 143.

Fol. 147. *Very little differing, as the King was unhappily perſwaded by them, from the Engliſh.*] Obſervator. *The Alterations being made, and ſhewed to the* King, *he approved well of them; in regard that comming neerer to the firſt Liturgy of King* Edward *the ſixth in the Adminiſtration of the Lord Supper, it might be a meanes to gain the Papiſts to the Church, who liked far better of the firſt, then ſecond Liturgy.*

Anſwer. Though the King was ſhewed the Alterations of the Scottiſh Liturgy; yet might he ſo apprehend, or be perſwaded that the differences were ſmall; and yet might they be great for all that, and perhaps not diſcovered by him: They are not the multitude of words that create the greatneſſe of a difference; it was but one word, yea, but one vowel of that one word, about which the Orthodox Church and heretical Synagogue of *Arius* conteſted. But behold the reaſon why the King (as the Obſervator ſaith) approved of the Scotch *Liturgy*. It came neer to the firſt Liturgy of King *Edward* the ſixth in the Adminiſtration of the *Lords Supper*, and ſo might be a meanes to gain the Papiſts to the Church, who liked far better of the firſt, then ſecond *Liturgy*. That the Papiſts liked King *Edwards* firſt Liturgy (and conſequently the Scotiſh) better then the ſecond is without all diſpute,

diſpute; the very words of diſtribution of the Elements in both, being ſo framed, as they may conſiſt with *Tranſubſtantiation*. And yet a ſlender means to gain them to our Church. The gaining Papiſts to our Church, was indeed the great pretended project of 40 yeares continuance; and yet in all that time not ſo much as one taken with that bait. How many true Proteſtants have been loſt thereby, I grieve to think.

Page 144.

Obſervator. *Our Author here doth very well deſcribe the two Tumults at* Edinburgh, *upon the reading of the Book of Common Prayer; but he omits the great over-ſights committed by the King and the Lords of that Councel, in the conduct and carriage of that buſineſſe.*

Anſwer. Here the Obſervator (being between Hawk and Buzzard) flies at the whole Covy, taxing not onely the *King* (for that is nothing with him) but him and the Lords of the Scot'ſh Councel with overſights, great overſights: Sure things will be gallantly ordered, when our Obſervator comes to be of a Councel of State.

Page 151.

Fol. 151. *Becauſe it was the Biſhops War.*] Obſervator. *I am ſorry to ſee this paſſage have our Authors pen, whom I ſhould willingly have accounted a true* Son *of the Church, were it not for this, and ſome other paſſages, which ſavour more of the Covenanter.*

Anſwer. A Covenanter? yes no doubt of that, a through-paced Covenanter; but why ſo? Becauſe I call it the *Biſhops War*, and ſo did they. True, they did; and beſides them many an Engliſh Proteſtant: why might they not? Was it not a War undertaken at firſt in defence of their Hierarchy? Nay, one of no mean eſteem makes one of that Order the main cauſe of that War, by introducing the Liturgy amongſt them, *Sc. ſpe quidem laudabili, eventu verò peſſimo*; with a good intent, but exceeding ill ſucceſſe: why ſo? *Hinc ſiquidem, &c.* For from hence proceeded Tragedies, Tumults, War, and Invaſion. Now that War which an Arch-Biſhop occaſion'd, and which was entred into for maintaining that Hierarchy, may, I hope, without offence be called the *Biſhops War*. But here I am cut off; the Obſervator telling us that [Religion was but the vizard to diſguiſe that buſineſſe which covetouſneſſe and ſacriledge had the greateſt hand in] which he confirmes by this enſuing Narrative. [The King being engaged into a War with *Spain*, and deſerted by thoſe who engaged him in it, amongſt other wayes of aſſiſtance, was minded of a purpoſe his Father had of *Revoking* all Grants of Abby Lands, *&c.* which being veſted in

Elenchus Mat.

in the Crown, were by his Protectors in his Minority, conferred on many of the Nobility and Gentry, *&c.* Being reſolved upon the ſame courſe, he intends a Parliament in that Kingdome, appoints the Earle of *Nidderdale* to preſide therein, and armes him with inſtructions for paſſing of an Act of Revocation accordingly: who being on his way as far as *Barwick*, was there informed that all was in Tumult at *Edinburgh*; that a rich coach which he had ſent before to *Dalkeith* was cut in pieces, the poore horſes killed, the people ſeeming onely ſorry that they could not doe the like to the Earle himſelfe. Things being brought to this ſtand, and the Parliament put off with a *ſine Die*, the King was put to a neceſſity of ſecond Councels, *&c.*]

Anſwer. That many had other then Religious deſignes, there is little doubt, they hoping to obtain that honour or wealth in a troubled State, which they were confident they ſhould never arrive at in a calm. Now, as concerning this Relation, the Obſervator being a perſon to whom I am ſo much obliged, I cannot but as part of requital of his own labours, adde ſomething for illuſtration of his Story, and rectifying ſome miſtakes thereof. Know then, Reader, that this Earl of *Nidderdale*, of whom the Obſervator ſpeakes, was then no Earle, but the Lord *Maxwell*, no more but ſo; and the very Man, or I am deceived, mention'd in *Habernfield* Diſcovery. For, a rank Papiſt he was, and *Anno* 1624. went to *Rome* to receive the Popes extraordinary Benediction; which the Councel of *Scotland* hearing of, they ſet out a Bar, or Proſcription againſt him for departing the Kingdome without leave: Soon after, King *James* dying, he came over into *England*, and by the Dukes favour, whoſe Kinſwoman he had married, was, *Anno* 1625. joyned in Commiſſion with the Earle of *Anandale* (*Murrey*) for ſummoning a Parliament (not for Revoking of Church, and other lands formerly inveſted in the Crown) but for contribution of monies and ſhips againſt the *Dunkirkers*; and was deſigned to preſide there, with power to place and diſplace what Officers he pleaſed. In Order and Pomp ſutable to ſo great a Truſt, the *Lord* buyes him a Coach moſt radiant and richly gilded; this he ſends before him to *Dalkeith*. The Councel of *Scotland* having early notice of this, conſpire to adhere and ſtick cloſe together, and to oppoſe his commiſſion: And the ſurer to fruſtrate the Lords deſigne, they ſend to all the chief Towns informing them what was comming, deſiring they would ſend in the money with all expedition. The Townes conformed inſtantly, and all was done; yea the very undoing

and deſtruction of his glorious Coach, before the Lord *Maxwell* came to *Barwich*, and further he durſt not go, being informed his perſon ſo generally hated, might be in great danger there, but poſted amain to the Court of *England*, where finding the King cool in the buſineſſe (having had an account from the Councel of *Scotland* of al their proceedings, & advertiſed by them how diſpleaſing a *Preſident* that *Lord* was like to prove, in reſpect of his Religion) & h the *Duke* gone to the *Hague*, after him he goes, and returnes with him into *England*. The *Duke* and this *Lord* being come to Court, poſſeſſe the King with ſtrange inſolences and affronts committed by the Councel of *Scotland* againſt his Regal power. His *Majeſty* in ſome indignation thereupon ſends for them to come forthwith, and anſwer what he had to object againſt them: up they come to court, and being by his Majeſty chidden for their miſcarriages, they defying this Lord openly in his Majeſties preſence, ſpake withal bug words, not very loyal 'tis confeſt; whereat his Majeſty told them then, and not before, he would make them reſtore all to the Crown, which they had taken from it in his Fathers Minority. This and ſomewhat more, my information from a credible hand, and of a date agreeable to the ſtory, what ſucceeded hereupon the Obſervator tells you.

Page 163.

Fol. 161. *The King firſt named eight Biſhops, then thoſe eight Biſhops choſe eight Noble men, thoſe Noble men choſe ſo many Barons, and thoſe the like number of Burgeſſes, &c.* Obſervator. *Not altogether ſo as our Author hath it, for the Biſhops and Noble men together choſe eight Commiſſioners for the Sheriffdomes and as many for the Corporations.*

Anſwer. My informer being a Perſon of ſuch eminency of that Nation, and ſo verſed in the affairs of that Kingdome; is, I think, more credible in this particular then a forreigner.

Page 171.

Fol. 182. *True it is he had too much and too long favoured the Romiſh* Faction, *but as upon what account he favoured it is uncertain, &c.*] *Our Author here acquits the Archbiſhop from the* Popiſh *faith, but leaves him under a ſuſpition of favouring the Popiſh faction; which in a man who cannot tell upon what account he favoured it, may be thought uncharitable. But both King* James *and King* Charles *in ſeveral Declarations give this Reaſon for it, &c.*

Anſwer. It is I think, no uncharitable act to cenſure any man for what is profeſſedly true, no matter upon what account;

count; to condemn a man for what is but a bare ſurmiſe may be uncharitable. And that the *Archbiſhop* favoured the *Popiſh* faction, our Obſervator doth not only grant, but endeavors to ſhew upon what account it was; ſaying [Both King *James* and King *Charles* in ſeveral Declarations, and in their ſeveral Anſwers to Parliament Petitions give this reaſon for it] for it? for what? for the Archbiſhops favouring the Popiſh faction? did ever any ſuch thing ever enter into their thoughts, as to declare what moved the Archbiſhop to favour the Romiſh faction? I will not dwell upon this reaſon which the Obſervator would perſwade us he had for it, that is, therefore to obtain like favours for ſuch *Proteſtants* as lived in the Dominions of Popiſh Princes; nor on what he *might* have had, of keeping the ballance even between them and the *Puritans*. But deliver what, having heard formerly, but upon dubious report, I am I think, certainly informed was the true cauſe thereof. For being told by one, that he had many an ill look from the Commons upon that very account, *True*, ſaid he, *I believe it, but ſomething muſt be done to pleaſe the Queen.*

Page 172.

Fol. Ibid. *He tampered indeed to introduce ſome ceremonies bordering upon Superſtition, diſuſed by us and abuſed by them; from whence the* Romaniſts *collected ſuch a diſpoſition in him to their Tenets, as they began to cry him up for their proſelyte.*] Obſervator. *In this* Paſſage *many things are to be conſidered. Firſt, theſe Ceremonies are not here ſaid to be* ſuperſtitious, *but only to* border *upon* ſuperſtition. *Secondly, they are ſaid to be* diſ-uſed, *which ſhews they were ſtill in force. Thirdly, that theſe ceremonies had been* abuſed *by them of the* Church of Rome, *and therefore might lawfully be reſtored; for* abuſus non tollit uſum.

Anſwer. The firſt is confeſt. The ſecond is really a very dumb ſhew; the word *diſuſed* doth not at all imply that thoſe ceremonies were in force, but only that the Reformers of our Church, obſerving how much they had been abuſed by the Church of *Rome*, thought fit not to retain but lay aſide the uſe of them; Thirdly, *things abuſed may be lawfully reſtored to their Primitive uſe*, but then it muſt be by lawful Authority, and in a lawful manner. And the *lawfulneſſe* of their reſtauration, doth not import an *expediency*, the Apoſtle putting ſuch a difference between theſe two.

Page 176.

Fol. 184. *This Archbiſhops Predeceſſor penultine and laſt but one.*] Obſervator. *He was not Dr.* Whitgift, *but Dr.* Bancroft.

Anſwer. Confeſt, as I ſaid before, a lapſe of memory.

Ibid.

Fol. Ibid. *That is, as a witty Gentleman ſaid well,* a new Synod; made *of an old Convocation.*] Obſervator. *This witty Gentleman here meant was Sr.* Edward Deering.

Anſwer. Here the Obſervator is wofully out; for the witty Gentleman here meant was not Sr. *Edward Deering*; no ſuch words to be found in al his ſpeeches, but it was the Lord *Digby* his ſpeech *Nov.* 19. 1640. and conſequently this learned deſcant upon Sr. *Edward* is out of doores.

Page 179.

Fol. Ibid. *By a new* Commiſſion *from the King.*] *No ſuch matter verily; the new* Commiſſion *which he ſpeaks of, gave them no ſuch power; The writ by which they were firſt called and made to be a* Convocation, *gave them power to ſit, and by that writ they were to ſit as a Convocation, til by another writ proceeding from the ſame Authority they were diſſolved.*

Anſwer. I ſhall here deliver the true ſtate of this buſineſſe, and then ſubmit to the judgement of ſtanders by. *Feb.* the 20th. 1639. the Convocation writs went forth to the ſeveral Archbiſhops of *Canterbury* and *York*, for the Election of Clerks to the Convocation; in which writs though there were theſe words *ad tractandum, conſentiendum, & concludendum, &c.* Yet could not the Convocation *Treat, conſent,* or *conclude* any thing without a ſpecial Commiſſion enabling them thereto. This Commiſſion therefore was iſſued out *April* the 15. two dayes after the Parliament ſate and impowred the Houſes of Convocation [to alter, amend and change the old Canons, and to make new during the Parliament.] So that the Parliament being diſſolved *May* the 5. by conſequence this Commiſſion expired by the Obſervators own conceſſion; but though the Commiſſion was nulled, it was a queſtion ſtill whither the Convocation was ſo alſo: In the enſuing Parliament it was agreed that it was; and if it was not, yet was it beheld to have ſo little life in it, as the King thought fit to re-animate it with a new Commiſſion, bearing date *May* 12, Authorizing it to make Canons, &c. And to continue during his Majeſties pleaſure. Notwithſtanding this Commiſſion, the Obſervator tells us [That the King for ſatisfation of ſome ſcrupulous members of the lower houſe, propounded the Queſtion to ſome eminent Lawyers, who reſolved under their hands [That the Convocation being called by the Kings writ, was to continue until it were diſſolved by the Kings writ, notwithſtanding the diſſolution of the Parliament.] All which

is

is very true, but not all the truth; for the light-fingerd Obſervator hath pocketed up the break-neck of the buſineſſe, ſuppreſſing what thoſe Lawyers ſent along with their opinions, *viz.* that notwithſtanding them, they would adviſe the Convocation in making of Canons to be very ſparing, as I am enformed by a member of that Convocation, and one (no matter who) as knowing and credible a perſon as that aſſembly had any.

Page 182.

Fol. Ibid. *Biſhops and Presbyters in Scripture-Phraſe being of equivalent import, and denoting the ſelf ſame perſons without the leaſt diſtinction.*] Obſervator. *When our Author playes the Hiſtorian in relating of ſuch things as are built upon good intelligence, he doth it very well, few better; but when he comes to ſhew his opinion in matters of controverſie, he doth it very ill, none worſe. For firſt, I do not believe our Author can eaſily prove Biſhops and Presbyters to be of equivalent import.*

Anſwer. Out upon this Obſervator who is ſo groſly *out* in both; for really there are many better Hiſtorians then my ſelf, and ſome worſe diſputants; the Obſervator for one; but a very much worſe Obſervator, I am certain; for had he not been an ill-looking-fellow, he might with half an eye have diſcerned, that I do not at all deliver mine own opinion in this particular, but what *many did then aſſert*; thoſe are the very words; and that *many* did ſo *aſſert*, is without all diſpute: but ſince the Obſervator will needs have it to be mine own judgement, it ſhall be ſo for once, and he have his ſaying. And what I pray doth he oppoſe againſt it? but [firſt, want of Logick, to inferre an identity or ſameneſſe in the thing, from a Community of names, and proves it by St. *Peter*, who calls our Saviour Chriſt 1 *Pet.* 2. 25. the Biſhop of our ſouls, and himſelf 1 *Pet. verſe* 1. a Presbyter or Preiſt (as moſt unhandſomely our Engliſh reads it) an Elder, concluding from thence, that it were ſorry Logick to make *Chriſt*, & every ordinary *Biſhop*, and the *Prince* of the *Apoſtles*, and a ſimple *Presbyter* all one. I ſhall firſt take leave to obſerve his *Parentheſis*, before I paſſe further. Herein he hath a fling at our Tranſlators, for rendring the word Presbyter, Elder; where's the unhandſomeneſſe of it? All Latine Expoſitors, and Greek *Lexicons*, tranſlate πρεσβύτερος *ſenior*; and I believe it will puzzle the Obſervator, to find any one who ever interpreted *ſenior* by *Prieſt*; and why, I would gladly know, is it more unhandſome in our Tranſlators, then it was in Dr. *Heilen* (from whom the Obſervator differs vaſtly in this particular) who tells us, that the ancient Fathers called the Miniſter

Antidot. Lincoln. Edit. 2. *p.* 157.

niſter of the *Sacrament of the Altar* ſometimes Presbyter, *Elder*, and ſometimes *Sacerdos*, *Prieſt*: a thing ſo univerſally received amongſt us, as you ſhall very rarely finde the word Presbyter turned into Prieſt, and never *Sacerdos* into *Elder*; now it being ſo rare to finde Presbyter otherwiſe rendred then by Elder, a vulgar tranſlation ſhould be accommodated to vulgar apprehenſions; for a modern Poet, and a wit every inch of him, gives us this golden Rule,

Return old vertues, but forbear
New words not fitted to the Ear.

But now *ad rem*, and to the mans arguments, which is nothing *ad rem*, and clear beſides the cuſhion, a meer ſhift and no more; for doth any man doubt that the theſis is limited to Goſpel-perſons initiated into ſacred orders, beneath the Apoſtles, and above Deacons? Let him or any men elſe, tell me where ſuch perſons in Holy Text are really diſtinguiſhed, that is, where Presbyters import not *Biſhops*, and Biſhops *Presbyters*, and then he ſhall be confeſt to ſpeak to purpoſe, to much better purpoſe then the Obſervator, who produceth the order of the late Church of *England* in the ordaining of *Biſhops*, when we talk of thoſe whom Holy Text calls *Biſhops*, not what they were in ſucceeding times, or are in our Church. And thus I have *knockt down Epiſcopacy*, ſaith the Obſervator, *with a painted club*: Dead as a door-nail no doubt, yet really not ſo much as touched I dare ſay for it; I am ſure *Epiſcopacy*, I mean *Epiſcopacy* by *Divine Right*, may live many a fair day after it, notwithſtanding that aſſertion, the other 1300. years, as it hath done already (for ſo long it is ſince St. *Hieromes* time, whoſe opinion all men know it was *in terminis*) and yet for all that, by the leave of *Smectymnuus*, he as great a friend to Epiſcopacy as any other *Father*; and not more then my ſelf. That there was in the Apoſtolique *Church*, a *Prelacy*, a *Superiority* inſtituted, of ſome one (no matter how denominated) over other Presbyters, within ſome certain walks and precincts; that this *Superiority* was appointed by the very *Apoſtles*, to be exemplary, and to give law to ſucceeding times, I do as little doubt, and think it as demonſtrable out of Scripture as any thing whatſoever not fundamental. That the perſons ſelected for ſo high a function, ſhould be men of the moſt eminent quality for piety and learning, there is all the reaſon in the world; and if ſuch a choyce be once made, as *de facto* in ſome it now is, judge others what they pleaſe, I ſhall account them meriting the greateſt Reverence and honour (taken in the moſt Advantageous

tagious ſenſe, either for dignity or maintenance, that any ſubjects are capable of. Soules of the moſt noble ſize muſt have elbow-room, they cannot exerciſe their activity in an anguſt and narrow Sphere. The internal Grandour of the mind, may perhaps exiſt; viſible, conſpicuous it cannot be, without external Grandour of Eſtate. Againe, the entries and advenues to advancement, are free and open to *Profeſſions* under-graduates to the *Sacred*; why then ſhall this be excluded? If Merit be all-ſufficient to entitle it poſſeſſor to Preferment; what Merit greater then what is reſident in perſons of Holy Orders? To defraud others of their due Reward, can at worſt be but injuſtice; to rob theſe differeth nothing from *Sacriledge*. This is my ſenſe of Epiſcopacy; enough, I hope, to ſatisfie ſpirits of the moſt modeſt and ſober temper; and for others, they are beneath my conſideration. This done, I ſhall jog on to attend the Obſervators next motion.

Page 186.

Fol. *Ibid.* *Such a prejudice there was againſt them, and the truth contended for lay then ſo deep as few had perſpicacity enough to diſcern it.*] Obſervator. *Though ſome men blind with prejudice, had not the perſpicacity of diſcerning Truth, yet ſome others had; yet for the opening of the eyes, as well of men willing to be informed, as wilfully blinded, no ſooner had the* Smectymnuans *revived the Controverſie, but preſently the Divine Right of Epiſcopacy was maintained and publiſhed by Dr.* Hall, *then Biſhop of* Exeter, *&c.*

Anſw. Though theſe obſervations little touch my *Free-hold*; yet I ſhall take a ſuperficicial view of his Authors. D. *Hall*, the moſt Reverend and Holy Bp. of *Exeter*, leads the Van; next comes *Churchman*, but whether *Goodman*, Worſhipful, right Worſhipful, Honorable, right Honorable, right Reverend *Churchman*, he tels us not: There is indeed ſuch an Author extant, but what's in him? really, nothing but what he hath ſtollen from Archb. *Whitgift*. Bp. *Bilſon*, Bp. *Hall*, and others, and is worn as thredbare a sthis Obſervators coat: Then he goes on to Dr. *Tailor*, and Dr. *Hammond*, theſe all of a cloth, and but *Churchman*, good men and true. Next, he proceeds to Lay-Champions, Sir *Thomas Aſton*, Mr. *Theyr*, the Lord *Falkland*, and in the tag-end of all, would you think it? learned Mr. *Selden*, not totally againſt *Biſhops*. But verily the man did not conſult Mr. *Selden* when he wrote this; for certain I am, that in his *de Synedris* page 423. he ſeems clear of another mind, extolling *Salmaſius*, and *Walo-Meſſalinus*, a note above *Ela*, for their paines in the Argument of Eccleſiaſtical

siastical Order; though I professe I see little solid in either. Before I leave the Observator, I cannot but take notice, that I misse amongst his Assertors for *Episcopacy*, one, who though he is *No-body* with the *Observator*, is *Some-body* with all men else, and that is King *Charles*, the Chief ὑπερασπιστὴς of that Cause; who did not only take up the Bucklers in good earnest, but the pen also to defend it; and by the last did so gallantly acquit himselfe of his opponents, so solidly, so perspicuously refute them, as *Smectymnuus, & qui Smectymnuuntur ab illis*, and all their adherents will never be able to make head against it again.

Page 189.

Fol. *Ibid.* *It was of so mysterious import, as the very Imposers, much lesse the Jurors, could not decipher what it meant, &c.*] Observator. *I find by this that our Author hath spoken with very few of the Convocation.*

Answer. Were not malice ἀσυλλόγιστόν τι, such a brutish and an ill-reasoning thing, (as *Gregory Nazianzen* calls it) sure the *Observator* might have easily discovered, that these faults imputed to the Canon, are not delivered as of mine owne suggestion, but contrived by others: If any doubt of this, he may consult the Lord *Dygbies* Speech *Novemb.* 12. 1640. the Exceptions taken against this oath by the Counties of *Northamptonshire*, of *Kent*, more especially those of *Devonshire*, framed at the Summer Assizes there 1640. formed by the Earle of *Bath*, and most of the Gentry and Clergy; and *Septemb.* the 16. presented with a Petition to the Lords of the Privy Councel; in every one of which he shall find almost every objection here mention'd, and in all many more.

Page 191.

Fol. *Ibid.* *To exact an Oath of dissent from Civil Establishments in such things of indifferency, was an affront to the very fundamentals of Government.*] Observator. *Our Author taking it for granted, that the Government of the Church by Bishops is a thing of indifferency, is much aggrieved that the Clergy should binde themselves by Oath not to consent to any alteration of it.*

Answer. Quousq; abuteris patientiâ nostrâ? How doth this Observator provoke us? Verily Reader, we must be at the charge of a Remembrancer for him. He is at his Author againe, when his Author quoteth others words: And what saith his Author? *That the Government of the Church by Bishops is a thing of indifferency*; Really this Senior Sophister hath no aym in his hand, be the Author who he will, certainly

tainly he declares no ſuch matter; his words are, *Some things were expreſly to be ſworn to which were never thought, to have any ſhew or colour of Sacred Right, but were conceived arbitrary and things of indifferency, &c.* Now theſe ſome things do not *ſignanter* and expreſly point out Epiſcopacy, but clearly exclude it; for they are ſaid to be ſuch things as never had any ſhew or colour of ſacred Right; but Epiſcopacy, in the very account of its adverſaries, hath ſome colour and ſhew of it. And to put the matter out of all diſpute, this Objection was the Lord *Digbyes*, who was a firm friend of Epiſcopacy, as my Hiſtory renders him. So then theſe ſome things mention'd in the Objection, will be ſoon decipher'd by Arch-Biſhops, Arch-Deacons, Deans, *&c.* as the *Northamptonſhire* and *Kent* Exceptions ſay expreſly.

Page 196.

Fol. 186. *No Convocation having power to grant any Subſidies or ayd without conſent of the Parliament.*] Obſervator. I *muſt letour Author (and all who ſhall read him) know that never was any rule more falſe, nor more weakly grounded.*

Anſwer. Spoken Magiſterially enough. What, never any rule more falſe? How comes it then to paſſe, that ſo many Wiſe and Learned Men in this Parliament ſhould be tranſported into a different Judgment? Nor is *the Rule more falſe then weakly grounded*, if we believe the Obſervator; truly by his leave there is ground enough to bear that Rule, or wiſer men then either *he*, or *I*, are miſtaken. For, doth not the Convocation conſtantly *moſt humbly pray and deſire their Grants and Subſidies may be confirmed and ratified by the High Court of Parliament?* Are not their Subſidies alwayes in the Statute-books aſſigned a particular chapter beginning thus, *A Confirmation of a Subſidy, &c. granted by the Clergy*? Now I would gladly learn of the Obſervator, if the *Convocation* be all-ſufficient of it ſelfe to grant Subſidies, why is the Parliaments Ratification ſought for, which muſt ſignifie either all or nothing?

Page 215.

Fol. 202. *And on the* 18th *he was voted guilty of High Treaſon.*] Obſervator. *Our Author may pleaſe to know, that on Wedneſday,* December *the* 16. *a Committee was appointed to draw up againſt him (the Arch-Biſhop) and the ſame day, not on the* 17th. *he was named an Incendiary by the Scots, no complaint comming from them on the Thurſday.*

Anſwer. The Obſervator may be diſpleaſed to know that in this particular he is as arrant an Errant as ever was.

The Journals, had he ſearcht them, would have told him, that [on Thurſday *Decemb.* the 17th. there was a conference between the two Houſes: At that meeting the Lord *Paget* read the Scotch Charge againſt the Lieutenant of *Ireland* and the Archbiſhop. It was many ſheets of paper cloſe written, and in *folio*, *&c.*] So that here is a complaint from the Scots againſt the Archbiſhop, and in this charge the Archbiſhop was named an Incendiary.

Page 217.

Obſervator. *I remember that congratulating him (the Biſhop of* Lincoln*) for the high eſteem which he had in both Houſes of Parliament*, &c.

Anſwer. By this, and what follows, I perceive this Obſervator had ſome Intimacy with this Biſhop at this time. Now, gentle Reader, if thou loveſt me, beg his reſolution in this one Queſtion; if I do not wrong thoſe credible perſons who informed me, to call it a Queſtion. I have been told that Doctor *Heylin* (I will not ſay a party to theſe premiſſes) who all the world knows moſt inſolently trampled and inſulted upon this Biſhop when he was down; no ſooner heard of his enlargement, but inſtantly he came creeping, and cringing, and crawling, and crowching to him ſo ſervilely, as made his Lordſhip merry at the uncouth ſight; and all this to ſtand his friend, or at leaſt not appear his foe at that time, when that Doctor was in a moſt ſorry plight. Now I would gladly know of this Obſervator, was it ſo, or no?

Page 221.

Obſervator. *I have ſome reaſon to believe that the Clergy of that* Convocation *did not appear there by their Councel learned, ſufficiently authorized and inſtructed to advocate for them.*

Anſwer. How their Councel were inſtructed I will not determine; ſure I am by their Councel they did appear, firſt, by Mr. *Chadwel* of *Lincolnes Inne*, *November* the 26th. then again by Mr. *Holborn* this 15th. of *Decemb.* who argued two hours in defence of them.

Page 224.

Fol. 219. *The Biſhops were excluded by ancient Canon-Laws of the Councel of* Toledo *to be aſſiſtant in cauſe of Blood or Death.*] Obſervator. *That they were diſabled from being aſſiſtant in ſuch Caſes, I believe our Author cannot prove.*

Anſwer. Let the fourth *Canon* ſpeak for me and it ſelf in this point. [*Si quis Sacerdotum diſcurſor in alienis periculis extiterit, apud Eccleſiam proprium perdat Gradum.*] If any Prieſt ſhall

ſhall intermeddle in caſes endangering the life of others, let him be degraded.

Page 235.

Fol. 256. *They paſted upon the gate of* Weſtminſter *a Catalogue of all ſuch whoſe ſuffrages were for the Earls acquittal, under the ſtile of* Straffordians.] Obſervator. *This paper was not paſted upon the gate of* Weſtminſter, *but on the corner of the wall of Sir* William Brunkards *houſe.*

Anſwer. Several and various are the Reports concerning this paper; ſome agreeing with the *Obſervator*; ſome relating it to be paſted on the head of an hogſhead. What I conceived moſt probable, and was moſt generally received, I fixt upon, not undertaking to warrant the circumſtance, but the thing.

Page 238.

Fol. *Ibid. The Proteſtation formed, was the next day read in the lower Houſe, and generally taken by all the Members.*] Obſervator. *Our Author is here out, as in that before; the Proteſtation not being taken the next day after, but on the very ſame day it was framed.*

Anſwer. If his Author was no more *out* in that before, then in this, he is *in* ſtill I dare warrant him. For the Proteſtation being debated on the third of *May*, *the ordering and framing thereof kept the Houſe all that day till late at night.* So the Journals of that week, which alſo preſent us with the reading, and taking thereof the next day by the whole Houſe.

Page 240.

Fol. 257. *In this perplexity of thoughts he conſults with four Biſhops.*] Obſervator. *Not ſent for by himſelfe, but ſent to him by the Houſes of Parliament. The Perſons ſent on this imployment, were the Primate of* Armagh, *the Biſhops of* Lincoln, Durham, *and* Carliſle. *Of which, the two laſt being men unskill'd in politick Affaires, depended wholly on the judgement of the other two; and thoſe carried a ſharp tooth againſt the Lord Lieutenant upon former grudges. The diſpleaſure which the Primate had conceived againſt him, was for the abrogating of the Articles of Religion eſtabliſhed in the Church of* Ireland, *and ſettling in their place the Articles of the Church of* England, *Anno* 1633.

Anſwer. Was ever man ſo ſhamefully out, as this *Obſervator* is here? out of the Story beyond all meaſure, and out of charity beyond all Religion. Firſt theſe Biſhops were not ſent by the *Parliament* to the King, but ſent for by Him.

Secondly, they were five, not four. Thirdly, if any of them depended upon the judgement of the others, it was the Biſhop of *London*, who at the laſt meeting and conſultation ſpake not one ſyllable. As for the Biſhops of *Durham* and *Carlile*, they ſpake as freely as any other, inſomuch as the King faulted one of their Syllogiſmes, becauſe it had in it four terms. Fourthly, the Lord *Primate* had no *ſharp tooth* againſt the Lieutenant, as the Obſervator or Malice it ſelf ſuggeſts; a calumny ſo abſurd, as nothing but the ſin thereof can defend it from being ridiculous, not a ſyllable relating to it being true; for, Firſt the Articles of Religion eſtabliſhed in the Church of *Ireland* were never abrogated, as is evidenced by this Certificate.

We who were preſent at, and Members of the Convocation holden at Dublin Anno Domini 1634. *doe hereby certifie, that upon the propoſal of the firſt Canon, wherein, for the manifeſtation of our agreement with the Church of* England *in the confeſſion of the ſame Chriſtian faith, and doctrine of the Sacraments (as was then expreſſed) we did receive and approve the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon in the Convocation holden at* London *in the year* 1562. *One of the Aſſembly ſtood up and deſired that the other Book of Articles agreed upon in the Convocation holden at* Dublin *in the year* 1615. *ſhould be joyned therewith: Unto whom it was then anſwered, that this addition was altogether needleſs, that Book having been already ſufficiently ratified by the Decree of the former Synod. But that the leaſt motion was then or there made for the ſuppreſſing of thoſe Articles of* Ireland, *hath no truth all in it; And therefore the Obſervator, and whoſoever elſe hath, or doth averr that the ſaid Articles either were aboliſhed, or any motion made for the ſuppreſſing or aboliſhing of them, are groſſly miſtaken, and have abuſed the ſaid Convocation, in delivering ſo manifeſt an untruth.* March 18. 1655.

Wil. Bernard.

Samuel Pullein.

Now the Foundation failing, the ſuperſtructed grudge muſt needs fall alſo. Again, that there was not between the Lord *Primate* and the *Earl* any the leaſt umbrage of diſcontent; that all was moſt amicable, moſt friendly between them, is further ſo likely, as it is almoſt demonſtrable. For before his final Sentence, the *Lieutenant* did from time to time, both at the *Black-Rod*, and in the *Tower*, adviſe with the *Primate* concerning his Anſwer to his Charge. For after Sentence, he deſired and obtained of the *Parliament*, that the

the *Primate* might be ſent to him to ſerve him with his Miniſterial Office in his laſt and fatal extremity; he cheerfully entertained his ſpiritual inſtructions, he prayed with him, ſent Meſſages to the King by him, took him by the hand and led him along with him to the Scaffold: All which ſure he would never have done, had he taken notice, or but ſuſpected ſuch a grudge *levant* and *couchant* in the *Primates* breaſt. Fifthly, whereas this Trifler deriveth this forged grudge from this occaſion [becauſe, ſaith he, Dr. *Bramhil*, once the *Lieutenants* Chaplain, and then Biſhop of *Derry*, had appeared moſt in Abrogation of thoſe Articles] I muſt tell the man that there was never any controverſie in that Synod between the Lord *Primate* and that *Biſhop* concerning thoſe Articles: About the Reception of the Engliſh Eccleſiaſtical Canons, ſome diſagreement there was indeed, the Biſhop of *Derry* moving they might be there admitted intirely, which the Lord *Primate* oppoſed as prejudicial to the liberty of the *Iriſh* Church, and prevailed that only ſome ſelected Canons of the *Engliſh* Church ſhould be received with the addition of others of that *Synods* framing, which was done accordingly. Sixthly, whereas the *Obſervator* placeth the Synod of *Ireland* in *Anno* 1633. his *alter idem* Dr. *Heylins* Hiſtory of the Sabbath, part 2d. page 259. could have told him it was in 1634. Laſtly, whereas this *Obſervator* demands an account of our thoughts whether [*the King was likely to be well informed in his Conſcience, when men ſo intereſſed were deſigned to the managing and preparing of it?*] I can aſſure him that the Biſhops only ſent him to the reſolution of his own judgement for *matter of fact*, and to the opinions of the Judges *for matter of Law*; and that the reſtleſs and inſatiable ſcruple which ſo diſcompoſed his Majeſties Conſcience was this; That notwithſtanding he moſt earneſtly preſſed the *Judges* to declare the particular *Article* of the *Earls* charge, which (if proved) was Treaſon by an expreſſe Law of the Land, he could not extort from them one ſingle inſtance, nor any thing elſe, but that the *Earl* was *guilty upon the whole matter*, which he thought was too confuſed a general, upon which to ſhed the blood of one of the baſeſt, much more of the Nobleſt Orb.

Thus have I finiſhed my Animadverſions upon the Obſervators Matter. I ſhould next proceed to his Alphabetical Table, or Vocabulary of my uncouth words, which really is the Comical part of his Tragedies againſt me, and it were pity to loſe ſo much mirth. I ſhall therefore in liew of that Alphabet preſent thee Reader with a Catalogue, firſt of mine own, and then of his miſtakes, with ſome things

of

of remark reſulting from them both; and firſt for mine own.

Fol. 6. *In King* James *his interment*, May *the* 4th. *is put for the* 7th.
Ibid. *Concerning the Marriage of the Queen*, May *the* 8th *for the firſt.*
Fol. 20. *Dr.* Laud *Biſhop of* Bath *and* Wells, *for Biſhop of St.* Davids.
Fol. 71. *Archbiſhop* Abbot *his Keeper for the Lord* Zouch *his.*
Fol. 129. *Guild-Hall for Alderman* Freemans *houſe.*
Fol. 131. *All Counties for all Port Towns within the Realm.*
Fol. 136. *Earl of* Norhumberland *for the Earl of* Lindſey.
Fol. 184. *Arch-Biſhop* Whitgift *miſtaken one remove.*

Other things as errors there are, I confeſſe, charged upon me by the Obſervator; but ſome are dubious, and no *conſtat* they are errors. Some are infallibly demonſtrated to be no errors, and the reſt that are errors are none of mine. Of mine, theſe are a true and perfect account; and how far theſe comply for quality and number with what I pretend to in my Preface, I ſhall now examine. My words in that Preface are [Confident I am *I* ſtand ſecure againſt ſubſtantial falſhoods] Dares the Obſervator (though he as daring as another) ſay any one of theſe *falſhoods* are *ſubſtantial*, ſo as their rectification will deſtroy the frame of the Narrative to which they relate? I preſume he will not. Circumſtantial they are every one; and againſt circumſtantial, though I durſt not aſſume confidence, yet I *hoped* I ſtood ſecure alſo. And now how that hope hath failed me, ſhall be my next enquiry. The total of my lapſes and ſlips amount to eight; no more, if I have faithfully collected them, as I hope I have, and did really ſo intend; but leſt one or two ſhould be caſually omitted, I allow them to be 10. And being ſo, I appeal to thy ingenuous candor, gentle Reader, firſt, whether in deſcribing of at leaſt a thouſand circumſtances, it be not a greater miracle that I miſtook in but 10, then that I erred ſo many. Secondly, whether 10. errors in ſuch circumſtances, wherein the fame of no one man, the intereſt of no one cauſe, is either damnify'd, or advantaged, be ground ſufficient for ſo much clamour, ſo loud outcry, as would gladly raiſe the Country, yea the whole Nation againſt me. Laſtly, whether it would not have repreſented the Obſervator to be a man of more Chriſtian, yea Moral Principles, had he *vivâ voce*, by conference, or by letters hinted to me theſe miſtakes, as fit conſiderations for a ſecond impreſſion. Indeed

de ed the laſt is needleſſe, he having ſo fair and frequent opport unities of doing the firſt: True it is, acquaintance there is none between us, if acquaintance be taken for familiarity; but acquainted with my perſon he is, and I with his, ſo well, as he knows me perfectly without a *Nomenclator*.

How can it be otherwiſe conjectured? when the truth is, we have met in *London* at the ſame ſhop, I may ſafely ſay neer an hundred times; and to ſpeak more cloſe to the point, not leſſe then ten times, not only after the publication of my Hiſtory; but after he had, to my knowledge, perüſed it, and before he had entred one line of his Obſervations into the Preſſe. All which do evidently declare, that it was not my information, but a dear and precious quarrel he deſired.

Having given you this particular of mine own failings, I proceed to thoſe of the Obſervator himſelf, which I have not only ſaid, but proved to be Errours.

Page 64. *Denying the paper found in* Feltons *hat.*
Page 7. *Concerning* Peter Baro, *and the* Margarets *Profeſſorſhip.* 3.
Page 86. *Saying, Standing at* Gloria Patri *was never obtruded.*
Page 114. *Concerning the Sabbath* 2.
Page 122. *Concerning the ſetting forth of the Ships.* 2.
Page 176. *Sir* Edward Dering *for the Lord* Digby.
Page 215. *Archbiſhop of Canterbury voted an Incendiary* Decemb. *the* 16th. *for the* 17.
Page 238 *Concerning the taking of the Proteſtation.*
Page 24[illegible]. *Concerning the Biſhops ſent to the King, the Primate, and the Iriſh Articles.* 6.

The total whereof is 18. in 17 printed ſheets, almoſt two for one eſcaped from me in 70. which yet were diſpenſable in any man, were they but circumſtantiall, as mine, but when one of them tends to the very deſtruction of ſacred worſhip, as that of the Sabbath; and another to the defamation of one of the moſt glorious Lights of our Church: Theſe are unpardonable faults, were not both the ſufferers thereby above his obloquy. In this Catalogue I have forborn ſuch miſtakes as relate imediately to my ſelf. I have not minded him of his moſt notorous corrupting and falſifying my *Preface*; nor of his wilfull miſtaking other words for mine, which coſt him a ſixth part of his Pamphlet; nor yet his detorting & wreſtling mine owne words to his fancy, againſt their naturall mind and inclination, Things counter to the ingenuity he ſo pretends to in his Epiſtle made to me, to the ancient mode of ſimplicity, to which I wiſh he would conform

conform hereafter: Therefore, gentle Reader, when thou ſeeſt him next, after my hearty commendations, preſent him from me with his *Diſtich* again a little vary'd.

Uſe thou old vertues, I ſhall forbear
New words not fitted to the ear.

Addenda to the Obſervator Obſerved.

Page 6. *l.* 8. After the end of the Paragraph. But if any demand what made King *James* ſo ſtout an adverſary of the *Arminians*, the Obſervator hath an anſwer ready minted, an exceeding good one I aſſure you, and for which the *Arminians* have reaſon to thank him: *Reaſon of State*, he ſaith, *it was, and King-Craft*: how ſo? becauſe [the *Arminians* were united into a party under the command and countenance of *Olden-Barnevelt*, and by him uſed to undermine the power of *Maurice* then Prince of *Orange*] ſo then by the Obſervators own inference, *Reaſon of State and King-Craft* will not tolerate the *Arminians* in a Commonwealth; and if ſo, they well deſerved the name of a Faction, as he *page* 73. moſt aptly ſtileth them, as men having as ſtrong a tang of the *Jeſuites* in *Practical*, as *Dogmatical* concernments; and indeed a *Faction*, a turbulent, ſeditious *Faction*, the united Provinces found them all along from the firſt of their ſpawning there; more eſpecially in that wicked conſpiracy of *Barnevelt* who ſuffered moſt condignly upon that very account 1619, and in no leſs damnable and helliſh plot, about three years after, wherein the States ſitting in Councel at the *Hague*, and after them all other *anti-Arminian* Magiſtrates were deſtined to ſlaughter: but this plot aborting and miſcarrying, the next was to murder the Prince of *Orange*, to ſeiſe upon the Magazines, to diſplace all Officers both martial and civil, and commit an horrid Maſſacre upon all of different belief; all which was by a bleſſed providence diſcovered and prevented, four of the principal conſpirators hanged, and the reſt ſome impriſon'd, others baniſht. This was the deportment of the Obſervators *Faction* in the Netherlands, an argument they are none of the beſt Subjects, be their Doctrine as Orthodox as they pretend.

Page 10. *l. Penult.* At this mark * But ſeeing the Obſervator ſo diſliketh this impulſive of Irregularity, I will take it again

again & by exchange afford him another for it, which though not ſo publiquely declared, yet was by knowing men in thoſe affairs beheld as the real and genuine cauſe of this Commiſſion, and that was the Archbiſhops refuſal to licenſe Dr. *Sibthorp's* Book. But be the impulſive to it what it will, ſure I am Sr. *Henry Martin* told the Biſhops they would incur a *præmunire* did they act by this Commiſſion, and that Legally the Commiſſion which ſhould impower them ought to proceed from the *Archbiſhop*, not from the King: to whoſe advice the Biſhops did ſo far liſten as they ſuperſeded and forbore to act untill a while after they obtained leave and Commiſſion from the Archbiſhop.

FINIS.

A Catalogue of ſome Books Printed for, and ſold by *Edw. Dod* at the *Gun* in *Ivie-Lane.*

AN entire Commentary upon the whole Old Teſtament in 4. Vol. in Fol. wherein the diverſe Tranſlations and Expoſitions, literal and myſtical, of all the moſt famous Commentators both Ancient and Modern are propounded, examined, and judged of, for the more full ſatisfaction of the ſtudious Reader in all things, which compleateth the Authors Comment on the whole Bible, a Work, the like to which hath never yet been publiſhed in *Engliſh* by any man, written by *John Mayer* Doctor in Divinty.

The Expiation of a Sinner in a Commentary on the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*: Fol. by *T. L.* D.D. a learned and Reverend Divine.

The Juſtification of a ſinner being the main argument of S. *Pauls* Epiſtle to the *Galathians*, Fol. Written by the Author of the Expiation of a ſinner.

Thomæ Loſhintonii Logica analytica de principiis, Regulis & uſu Rationis Recta, 8.

The Angel Guardian proved by the light of Nature, beams of Scripture, and conſent of many Ancient and Modern Writers untainted with Popery; by *Robert Dingley* Maſter of Arts, late Fellow of *Magdalen* Colledge in *Oxford*; 8.

America, or an exact deſcription of the *Weſt-Indies*, eſpecially of thoſe Provinces under the dominion of *Spain*, in which not only the Nature and Climate of the place, with the Commodities it affordeth is fully deſcribed; but alſo plain and full directions given for the right ordering of the ſame, ſo as to fit them for the uſe of the Inhabitants, and alſo for tranſportation, the like never yet publiſhed in *Engliſh*, faithfully related by *N.N.* Gent. in 8.

Natures Paradox, or the Innocent Impoſtor, a pleaſant Polonian Hyſtory tranſlated out of *French* into *Engliſh*, by Major *John Wright*, 4.

Poems, Songs, and Sonets, written by *Richard Lovelace* Eſq. 8.

The Life and death of Mr. *Carter*, with other Tracts written by his ſon Mr. *John Carter* Miniſter of Gods Word in the City of *Norwich*; 8.

Directions for writing of true Engliſh by *Richard Hodges*, in 8.

The Reign of King *Charles* faithfully and impartially delivered and diſpoſed into Annals by *H.L.* Eſq. Fol.

Judgement and Mercy; or the plague of Frogs inflicted, removed: delivered in nine Sermons, by that late Reverend, and Learned Divine, Mr. *Joſias Shute*. 4.

The Safe way to Glory, in ſeveral Exerciſes of General uſe, By *William Smith* Mr. Ar. *R.* of *Cotton* in *Suff.*